

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, February 1, 1921.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point of order that there is no quorum present, and obviously there is none.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Andrews, Md.	Focht	Lufkin	Riordan
Ayres	Fordney	Luhning	Robinson, N. C.
Babka	Frear	McAndrews	Rowan
Beer	Gandy	McCulloch	Rowe
Blackmon	Ganly	McFadden	Rucker
Bland, Mo.	Goldfogle	McGlennon	Sabath
Bowers	Good	McKinley	Sanders, Ind.
Brinson	Goodall	McLane	Sanders, La.
Britten	Goodwin, Ark.	MacGregor	Sanford
Brooks, Pa.	Goodykoontz	Magee	Scully
Brumbaugh	Gould	Maher	Sells
Butler	Graham, Ill.	Mann, S. C.	Smithwick
Campbell, Pa.	Graham, Pa.	Mead	Steenerson
Candler	Hamill	Milligan	Stiness
Cantrill	Hamilton	Moon	Strong, Pa.
Carew	Harrison	Mooney	Sullivan
Carrs	Haugen	Moore, Va.	Tague
Casey	Hays	Moore, Ind.	Tinkham
Clark, Fla.	Hudspeth	Morin	Upshaw
Classon	Ireland	Mudd	Vare
Copley	James, Mich.	Murphy	Venable
Costello	Jeffers	Nelson, Wis.	Walters
Crowther	Johnston, N. Y.	Nolan	Watkins
Currie, Mich.	Kennedy, Iowa	Olney	Weaver
Davis, Tenn.	Kennedy, R. I.	Padgett	Whaley
Dent	Kettner	Pell	White, Me.
Donovan	Kitchin	Periman	Williams
Doelling	Kreider	Raney, Ala.	Wilson, Pa.
Egan	Lampert	Ransley	Wise
Ellsworth	Langley	Reavis	Woods, Va.
Emerson	Lehibach	Reed, W. Va.	
Ferris	Loneragan	Riddick	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and ninety Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Rev. George L. Mackintosh, D. D., president of Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Lord, Thou hast been our dwelling place in all the generations. We thank Thee for those who have gone before us in the way of human progress and enlightenment, for the prophets and the statesmen and the sages and the heroes. We pray that we may be enlightened and strengthened by their words and their example to high thoughts and true and noble endeavor. In this day of world debate and uncertainty, we pray Thy blessing upon all those who have in their hands temporarily the destinies of nations and the world. Bless the President of the United States and the Vice President and the coming President of the United States and the Vice President and all Members of our Houses of Congress, that they may be so inspired and so enlightened that they may put the good of the country, its prosperity, and its perpetuity before all private considerations whatsoever. We pray for our beloved country, that there may be peace and prosperity and happiness here, and happy and peaceful relations with all the countries of the world. We especially pray Thy blessing and guidance upon the business of the day, and that out of its deliberations may come some way of righteousness and truth and honor for us all and for our beloved country. We ask in the name of the great Master and Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. SNELL. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on what subject does the gentleman wish to address the House?

Mr. SNELL. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. If the gentleman wants to object, he can.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I object.

## RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The unfinished business is the river and harbor bill, and there was pending a motion of the gentleman from North Carolina to recommit the bill with instructions, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SMALL moves to recommit the bill to the committee with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following—

Mr. BEE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BEE. Is it necessary for the Clerk, under the rules, to read that entire substitute?

The SPEAKER. It is, unless it is omitted by unanimous consent.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading may be dispensed with. Everybody has a copy before him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I did not object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums of money be, and are hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be immediately available, and to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, for the construction, completion, repair, and preservation of the public works hereinafter named:

Newburyport Harbor, Mass.: For maintenance, \$2,000.  
 Boston Harbor, Mass.: For maintenance, \$40,000.  
 Pollock Rip Shoals, harbor of refuge at Nantucket, New Bedford, and Fairhaven Harbors, Fall River Harbor, and Taunton River, Mass.: For maintenance, \$25,000; continuing improvement and for maintenance of Pollock Rip Channel, \$150,000; in all, \$185,000.  
 Stonington and New London Harbors, Conn.: Pawcatuck River, R. I. and Conn.; and Mystic and Thames Rivers, Conn.: For maintenance, \$5,000.  
 Connecticut River above and below Hartford, Conn.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance below Hartford, \$65,000.  
 Duck Island, Branford, New Haven, Milford, Bridgeport, Southport, Norwalk, Five Mile River, Stamford, and Greenwich Harbors, Westport Harbor and Saugatuck River, breakwaters at New Haven, and Housatonic River, Conn.: For maintenance, \$105,000; continuing improvement of Stamford Harbor, \$100,000; in all, \$205,000.  
 New York Harbor, N. Y.: For maintenance of entrance channels and for continuing improvement of Ambrose Channel, Craven Shoal Channel, and Anchorage Channel, \$550,000.  
 Channel in Gowanus Bay, N. Y.: Continuing improvement of Red Hook Channel, \$150,000.  
 East River, N. Y.: Continuing improvement, \$3,000,000.  
 Newtown Creek, N. Y.: Continuing improvement, \$100,000.  
 Hudson River Channel, New York Harbor, N. Y.: Continuing improvement, \$750,000.  
 Burlington Harbor, Vt.: Plattsburg and Fort Henry Harbors, N. Y.; and Narrows of Lake Champlain, N. Y. and Vt.: For maintenance, \$20,000.  
 Newark Bay and Passaic River, N. J.: For maintenance, \$10,000.  
 Keyport and Shoal Harbors, Woodbridge, Cheesapeake, Matawan, and Compton Creeks, Elizabeth, Raritan, South, and Shrewsbury Rivers, and Raritan Bay, N. J.: For maintenance, \$32,500; continuing improvement of Raritan River, \$25,000; in all, \$57,500.  
 Delaware River, between Philadelphia, Pa., and Trenton, N. J.: For maintenance, \$12,500.  
 Delaware River, Pa., N. J., and Del.: For maintenance from Allegheny Avenue, Philadelphia, to the sea, \$2,000,000.  
 Cooper, Salem, Cohamsey, and Maurice Rivers, Woodbury, Mantua, Raccoon, Oldmans, and Alloway Creeks, N. J.: For maintenance, \$20,000.  
 Cold Spring and Absecon Inlets, Absecon and Tuckerton Creeks, and Toms River, N. J.: For maintenance, \$9,200; *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended on Absecon Inlet.  
 Wilmington Harbor, Del.: For maintenance, \$60,000.  
 Inland waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md.: Continuing improvement, \$1,000,000.  
 Appoquinimink, Smyrna, Leipsic, Little, St. Jones, Murderkill, Mispillon, and Broadkill Rivers, Del.: For maintenance, \$25,000.  
 Waterway from Chincoteague Bay, Va., to Delaware Bay at or near Lewes, Del.: For maintenance, \$1,500.  
 Waterway on the coast of Virginia: For maintenance, \$2,000.  
 Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Md.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$125,000.  
 Rockhall, Queenstown, Claiborne, Tilghman Island, Cambridge, and Crisfield Harbors, Elk and Little Elk, Chester, Corsica, Choptank, Tuckahoe, Warwick, La Trappe, Tred Aron, Wicomico, and Pocomoke Rivers, Slaughter, Tyaskin, and Broad Creeks, Twitch Cove and Big Thoroughfare River, and Lower Thoroughfare, Deal Island, Md.: Nanticoke River (including Northwest Fork), Del. and Md.; Broad Creek River, Del.; and Tangier Channel, Va.: For maintenance, \$20,000.  
 Potomac River, at Washington, D. C., at Alexandria, Va., and at Lower Cedar Point, Md.; Occoquan and Aquia Creeks, Va.: For maintenance, \$20,000.  
 Rappahannock, Mattaponi, and Pamunkey Rivers, and Urbana Creek, Va.: For maintenance, \$10,000.

James, Nansemond, Pagan, and Appomattox Rivers, Va.: For maintenance, \$5,000.

Norfolk Harbor and Channels, Va.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, including channel to Newport News, \$700,000.

Onancock River, Va.: For maintenance, \$5,000.

Waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C.: For maintenance, \$50,000.

Mantee Bay, Scuppernon, Pamlico, Tar, South, Bay, Neuse, and Trent Rivers, Fishing, Contentnea, Swift, and Smiths Creeks, and waterway connecting Swan Quarter Bay with Deep Bay, N. C.: For maintenance, \$25,000.

Beaufort and Morehead City Harbors, Beaufort Inlet, waterway from Pamlico Sound to Beaufort Inlet, waterway connecting Core Sound and Beaufort Harbor, channel connecting Thoroughfare Bay and Cedar Bay, and inland waterway Beaufort to Jacksonville, N. C.: For maintenance, \$2,500.

Northeast, Black, and Cape Fear Rivers, N. C.: For maintenance, \$100,000.

Winyah Bay, Waccamaw, Little Pee Dee, and Great Pee Dee Rivers, S. C.: For maintenance, \$10,000.

Santee and Congaree Rivers, S. C.: For maintenance, including the Estherville-Minim Creek Canal and the Congaree River as far up as the Gervais Street Bridge, Columbia, \$5,000.

Waterway between Charleston and Winyah Bay, S. C.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$15,500.

Charleston Harbor and Channels, S. C.: Continuing improvement to provide a channel 40 feet deep and 1,000 feet wide, extending from the sea to the Charleston Navy Yard, \$500,000.

Wappoo Cut, S. C.: For maintenance, \$4,000.

Savannah Harbor and Savannah River, below, at, and above Augusta, Ga.: For maintenance, \$366,000; continuing improvement of Savannah Harbor, \$300,000; in all, \$666,000.

Waterway between Beaufort, S. C., and St. Johns River, Fla.: For maintenance, \$40,000.

Sapelo and Darien Harbors, Cowhead and Satilla Rivers, and Fancy Bluff Creeks, Ga., and St. Marys River, Ga. and Fla.: For maintenance, \$20,000.

Altamaha, Oconee, and Ocmulgee Rivers, Ga.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$40,000.

Brunswick Harbor, Ga.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$100,000.

St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville to the ocean, Jacksonville to Palatka, and Palatka to Lake Harney, Lake Crescent, and Dunns Creek, and Oklawaha River, Fla.: For maintenance, \$422,000.

Indian River, St. Lucie Inlet, Miami Harbor (Biscayne Bay), and harbor at Key West, Fla.: For maintenance, \$60,500.

Kissimmee, Caloosahatchee, Orange, Anclote, Crystal, Withlacoochee, and Suwannee Rivers, Charlotte Harbor, Sarasota Bay, and Clearwater Harbor and Boca Ciega Bay, Fla.: For maintenance, \$13,500.

Tampa and Hillsboro Bays, St. Petersburg Harbor, Hillsboro and Manatee Rivers, Fla.: Continuing improvement of Hillsboro Bay, \$300,000.

Carrabelle Bar and Harbor, Apalachicola, St. Joseph and St. Andrews Bays, Apalachicola and Chipola Rivers, and channel from Apalachicola River to St. Andrews Bay, Fla.: Flint River, Ga.: and Chattahoochee River, Ga. and Ala.: For maintenance, including the cut-off, Lee Slough, lower Chipola River, and upper Chipola River from Marianna to its mouth, \$126,500; completing improvement of Flint River, \$10,000; in all, \$136,500.

Holmes and Blackwater Rivers, Fla.: Choctawhatchee, Escambia, and Conecuh Rivers, Fla. and Ala.: the narrows in Santa Rosa Sound, and Pensacola Harbor, Fla.: For maintenance, \$50,000.

Alabama River, Ala., and Coosa River, Ala. and Ga.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance of the Alabama River, including the Alabama and Coosa Rivers between Montgomery and Wetumpka, \$42,000.

Mobile Harbor and Bar, and channel connecting Mobile Bay and Mississippi Sound, Ala.: For maintenance of channel connecting Mobile Bay and Mississippi Sound, \$10,000; continuing improvement and for maintenance of Mobile Harbor and Bar, \$316,000; in all, \$326,000.

Gulfport Harbor, Miss.: For maintenance of anchorage basin at Gulfport and channel therefrom to the anchorage or roadstead at Ship Island, and for maintenance of channel at Ship Island Pass, \$100,000.

Pascagoula, Wolf, Jordan, Pearl, and East Pearl Rivers, and Biloxi Harbor, Miss.: For maintenance, \$10,000.

Passes at the mouth of the Mississippi River: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$2,000,000.

Lake Pontchartrain, Pass Manchac, Bogue Falls, Chefuncte, Ponchartroula, Natalbany, Blood, Tickfaw, and Amite Rivers, and Bayou Manchac, La.: For maintenance, \$9,700.

Barataria Bay and Bayous Lafourche, Terrebonne, Grossetete, Plaquemine, and Teche, La.: For maintenance, including Grand River and Pigeon Bayou, \$20,000; continuing improvement of Bayou Teche, \$50,000; in all, \$70,000.

Atchafalaya River, La.: For maintenance, \$30,000.

Waterway, from the Mississippi River to the Sabine River, La.: For improvement from Mississippi River to Bayou Teche, \$50,000; continuing improvement from Franklin to Mermentau, \$200,000; continuing improvement from Mermentau River to Sabine River, \$168,000; in all, \$418,000.

Bayous Vermilion, Nezperque, des Cannes, Plaquemine Brule, and Quebe de Tortue, Mermentau River, and Calcasieu River and Pass, La.: For maintenance, including channel, bay, and passes of Bayou Vermilion, and tributaries of Mermentau River, \$15,000.

Removing the water hyacinths, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas: For the removal of the water hyacinth from the navigable waters in the States named in so far as it is or may become an obstruction to navigation, \$17,500.

Galveston Harbor, Galveston Channel, Port Bolivar Channel, Texas City Channel, and Houston Ship Channel, Tex.: For maintenance, \$705,000; continuing improvement by construction of sea-wall extension to protect Galveston Channel, \$100,000.

Anahuac Channel, mouth of Trinity River, Oyster and Clear Creeks, and Cedar, Chocolate, Turtle, Bastrop, Dickinson, Double, and East Bay Bayous, Tex.: For maintenance, \$10,000.

Waterway from Galveston to Corpus Christi and channel from Pass Cavallo to Port Lavaca, Tex.: For maintenance, \$50,000.

Freeport Harbor, Tex.: Continuing improvement, \$160,000.

Port Aransas, Tex.: For maintenance, \$150,000.

Harbor at Sabine Pass and Port Arthur Canal, Sabine-Neches Canal, and Johnsons Bayou, La. and Tex.: For maintenance, \$217,000.

Red, Black, Ouachita, Tensas, Boeuf, and Saline Rivers, and Bayous Macon, Bartholomew, D'Arbonne, and Corney, Ark. and La.: For maintenance, \$55,000; continuing improvement of Ouachita River in accordance with the report submitted in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 7, Sixty-fifth Congress, second session, \$175,000; in all, \$230,000.

Yazoo River and tributaries, Mississippi: For maintenance, including Yazoo, Tallahatchie, Coldwater, and Big Sunflower Rivers, Tchula Lake, Steele and Washington Bayous, Lake Washington, and Bear Creek, \$25,000.

Arkansas River, Ark. and Okla.: For maintenance, \$20,000.

Black and Current Rivers, Ark. and Mo.; and White, St. Francis, and L'Anguille Rivers, and Blackfish Bayou, Ark.: For maintenance, \$50,000.

Mississippi River from the mouth of the Ohio River to and including the mouth of the Missouri River: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$500,000.

Mississippi River: For the removal of snags and wrecks from the Mississippi River below the mouth of the Missouri River, and from Old and Atchafalaya Rivers, in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in his annual report for 1920, \$25,000; in addition to amounts otherwise appropriated.

Mississippi River from the mouth of the Missouri River to Minneapolis, Minn.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$1,070,000.

St. Croix River, Wis. and Minn.; Minnesota River, Minn.; Lake Traverse, Minn. and S. Dak.; and Red River of the North, Minn. and N. Dak.: For maintenance, \$2,500.

Missouri River: For maintenance between Kansas City, Kans., from the upper end of Quindaro Bend, and the mouth of the river, \$225,000.

Ozage and Gasconade Rivers, Mo., and Kansas River, Kans.: For maintenance, \$10,000.

Cumberland River, Tenn. and Ky.: For maintenance above Nashville, \$5,000; continuing improvement below Nashville, \$150,000; in all, \$155,000.

Tennessee River, Tenn., Ala., and Ky.: For maintenance and continuing improvement, \$503,000.

Ohio River: Continuing improvement and for maintenance by open-channel work, \$300,000.

Ohio River: Continuing improvement by the construction of locks and dams with a view to securing a navigable depth of 9 feet, \$2,500,000.

Allegheny River, Pa.: For maintenance by open-channel work, \$10,000; continuing improvement by construction of locks and dams, \$250,000; in all, \$260,000.

Pittsburgh Harbor, Pa.: For maintenance, \$6,000.

Grand Marais, Marquette Bay, and Ontonagon Harbors, and Keweenaw Waterway, Mich.: Ashland and Port Wing Harbors, Wis.: Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.: Agate Bay and Grand Marais Harbors, Minn.: For maintenance, \$190,000; continuing improvements of Keweenaw Waterway, \$10,000; in all, \$200,000.

Warroad Harbor and River, Baudette Harbor and River, Zippel Bay, and Lake of the Woods, Minn.: For maintenance, \$3,800.

Manistique Harbor, Mich.: Menominee, Oconto, Green Bay, Algoma, Keweenaw, Two Rivers, Manitowoc, Sheboygan, Port Washington, Milwaukee, Racine, Kenosha, and Waukegan Harbors, Sturgeon Bay and Lake Michigan Ship Canal, and Fox River, Wis.: For maintenance, \$300,000; completing improvement of Racine Harbor, \$165,000; in all, \$465,000.

St. Joseph Harbor and River, Saugetuck Harbor and Kalamazoo River, South Haven, Holland, Grand Haven, Muskegon, White Lake, Pentwater, Ludington, Manistee, Portage Lake, Arcadia, Frankfort, Charlevoix, and Petoskey Harbors, and Grand River, Mich.: For maintenance, \$350,000; completing improvement of Ludington Harbor, \$55,000; in all, \$405,000.

Chicago and Calumet Harbors, Chicago and Illinois Rivers, Ill.: Calumet River, Ill. and Ind.: and Indiana and Michigan City Harbors, Ind.: For maintenance, \$390,000; continuing improvement of Calumet River, \$160,000; continuing improvement of Illinois River below Copperas Creek, \$46,000; continuing improvement of Indiana Harbor, \$200,000; in all, \$796,000.

Ship channel connecting waters of the Great Lakes between Chicago, Duluth, and Buffalo, including St. Marys River, St. Clair River, channels in Lake St. Clair and Detroit River, Mich.: For maintenance, \$119,000; continuing improvement of Livingstone Channel, Detroit River, \$750,000; in all, \$869,000.

The unexpended balance of appropriations heretofore made for the construction of the fourth lock in St. Marys River, Mich., is hereby made available for maintenance work in said St. Marys River.

MacKinnac, Cheboygan, Rogers City, Alpena, Harbor Beach, and Monroe Harbors, Saginaw, Black, Clinton, and Rogue Rivers, Mich.: For maintenance, \$60,000; continuing improvement of Rogue River, \$75,000; in all, \$135,000.

Toledo, Port Clinton, Sandusky, Huron, Vermilion, Lorain, Cleveland, Fairport, Ashabula, and Conneaut Harbors, Ohio: For maintenance, \$89,000.

erie Harbor, Pa.: Dunkirk and Buffalo Harbors, Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, and Niagara River, N. Y.: For maintenance, \$341,000; completing improvement of Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, \$170,000; in all, \$511,000.

Olcott, Charlotte, Greatodus Bay, Littleodus Bay, Oswego, Cape Vincent, and Ogdensburg Harbors, N. Y.: For maintenance, \$49,000; completing improvement of Oswego Harbor, \$50,000; in all, \$99,000.

San Francisco, Oakland, Richmond, Monterey, Humboldt, and Crescent City Harbors, Redwood, Petaluma, and San Rafael Creeks, Napa River, San Pablo Bay, and Suisun and Suisun Bay Channels, Calif.: For maintenance, \$145,000; continuing improvement of Richmond Harbor, \$160,000; completing improvement of Petaluma Creek, \$50,300; continuing improvement of Humboldt Harbor and Bay, \$250,000; for improvement of Crescent City Harbor in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 434, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, \$100,000; in all, \$705,300.

Sacramento, Feather, San Joaquin, and Mokelumne Rivers, and Stockton and Mormon Channels (diverting canal), Calif.: For maintenance, \$121,800.

Cocouille, Coos, Siuslaw, and Yaquina Rivers, and Coos, Yaquina, Tillamook, and Nehalem Bays, Ore.: For maintenance, \$151,000; continuing improvement of Yaquina Bay and Harbor, \$175,000; in all, \$326,000.

Cascades and Dalles-Cello Canals, Ore.: Columbia River and tributaries above Cello Falls to the mouth of Snake River, Ore. and Wash., and Snake River, Ore., Wash., and Idaho: For maintenance, \$5,000.



Columbia and lower Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg., and mouth of Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$500,000.

Willamette River above Portland and at Willamette Falls, Yamhill and Clatskanie Rivers, Oreg.; Cowlitz, Lewis, and Grays Rivers, and Skamokawa Creek, Wash.: For maintenance, \$50,000.

Willapa River and Harbor, Grays Harbor, Chehalis and Hoquiam Rivers, Wash.: Continuing improvement of Willapa River and Harbor, \$52,050.

Puget Sound and its tributary waters, Olympia, Seattle, Anacortes, Port Gamble, Tacoma, and Bellingham Harbors, Lake Washington Ship Canal, Snohomish and Skagit Rivers, Swinomish Slough, waterway connecting Port Townsend Bay and Oak Bay, Columbia River between Wenatchee and Kettle Falls, Wash.: For maintenance, \$25,000; continuing improvement of Lake Washington Ship Canal, \$65,000; in all, \$90,000.

Nome Harbor, Alaska: Continuing improvement and for maintenance of Nome Harbor, \$20,000.

San Juan Harbor, Porto Rico: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$400,000.

For examinations, surveys, and contingencies for rivers and harbors for which there may be no special appropriation, \$250,000: *Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be expended for any preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate not authorized by law.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion to recommit, for the reason that there is a provision in the motion making the funds immediately available, which is unauthorized by law, and it is new legislation on an appropriation bill. That clause will be found in the early part of the motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. SMALL and Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 121, nays 205, answered "present" 1, not voting 102, as follows:

## YEAS—121.

Almon	Dupré	Lazaro	Rodenberg
Aswell	Dyer	Lea, Calif.	Romjue
Bankhead	Eagle	Lee, Ga.	Rouse
Barkley	Evans, Mont.	Leshner	Rubey
Bell	Fields	Linthicum	Sears
Benson	Fisher	Luhning	Sherwood
Bland, Va.	Flood	McDuffie	Sims
Bowling	Gard	Major	Sinclair
Box	Garrett	Mansfield	Small
Brand	Godwin, N. C.	Martin	Smith, N. Y.
Briggs	Griffin	Mason	Smithwick
Byrnes, Tenn.	Hardy, Tex.	Mays	Steagall
Caldwell	Hayden	Minahan, N. J.	Stedman
Cantrill	Hoey	Monahan, Wis.	Steele
Caraway	Holland	Montague	Stephens, Ohio
Clark, Mo.	Howard	Moore, Va.	Stoll
Cleary	Huddleston	Nelson, Mo.	Taylor, Ark.
Coady	Hudspeth	O'Connell	Thomas
Collier	Hull, Iowa	O'Connor	Tillman
Cullen	Hull, Tenn.	Ogden	Venable
Curry, Calif.	Humphreys	Oldfield	Vinson
Davey	Igoe	Oliver	Welty
Davis, Tenn.	Jacoway	Overstreet	Wilson, La.
Denison	James, Va.	Padgett	Wilson, Pa.
Dewalt	Johnson, Ky.	Park	Wingo
Dickinson, Mo.	Johnson, Miss.	Pou	Woods, Va.
Doremus	Keller	Rainey, H. T.	Wright
Doughton	Kincheloe	Raker	Young, Tex.
Drane	King	Randall, Wis.	
Drewry	Lankford	Rhodes	
Dunbar	Larsen	Robison, Ky.	

## NAYS—205.

Ackerman	Chindblom	Fess	Hawley
Andrews, Nebr.	Christopherson	Fish	Hays
Anthony	Cole	Fordney	Hernandez
Ashbrook	Connally	Foster	Hersey
Bacharach	Cooper	Frear	Hickey
Barbour	Crago	Freeman	Hicks
Bee	Cramton	French	Hill
Begg	Crisp	Fuller	Hoch
Benham	Dale	Gallagher	Houghton
Black	Dallinger	Gallivan	Hullings
Bland, Ind.	Darrow	Garner	Husted
Blanton	Davis, Minn.	Glynn	Hutchinson
Boies	Dempsey	Good	Jefferis
Britten	Dickinson, Iowa	Goodykoontz	Johnson, S. Dak.
Brooks, Ill.	Dominick	Graham, Ill.	Johnson, Wash.
Browne	Lowell	Green, Iowa	Jones, Pa.
Buchanan	Dunn	Greene, Mass.	Jones, Tex.
Burdick	Echols	Greene, Vt.	Juul
Burke	Edmonds	Griest	Kearns
Burroughs	Elliott	Hadley	Kelley, Mich.
Butler	Elston	Hamilton	Kelly, Pa.
Byrnes, S. C.	Esch	Hardy, Colo.	Kendall
Campbell, Kans.	Evans, Nebr.	Harrel	Kless
Cannon	Evans, Nev.	Hastings	Kinkaid
Carter	Fairfield	Hauger	Klecza

Knutson  
Kraus  
Lampert  
Lanham  
Layton  
Longworth  
Luco  
McAndrews  
McArthur  
McClintic  
McFadden  
McKenzie  
McKeown  
McKinley  
McLaughlin, Mich.  
McLaughlin, Nebr.  
McLeod  
McPherson  
MacGregor  
Madden  
Magee  
Mann, Ill.  
Mapes  
Merritt  
Michener  
Miller  
Mondell

Moore, Ohio  
Mott  
Newton, Minn.  
Nolan  
Osborne  
Paige  
Parker  
Parrish  
Patterson  
Peters  
Phelan  
Porter  
Purnell  
Quinn  
Radcliffe  
Rainey, J. W.  
Ramseyer  
Randall, Calif.  
Ransley  
Rayburn  
Reavis  
Reber  
Reed, N. Y.  
Ricketts  
Rogers  
Rose  
Sanders, N. Y.

Schall  
Scott  
Sells  
Shreve  
Siegel  
Sinnott  
Slason  
Slomp  
Smith, Idaho  
Smith, Ill.  
Smith, Mich.  
Snell  
Snyder  
Stevenson  
Strong, Kans.  
Summers, Wash.  
Summers, Tex.  
Sweet  
Swindall  
Swope  
Taylor, Colo.  
Taylor, Tenn.  
Temple  
Thompson  
Tilson  
Timberlake  
Tinscher

Towner  
Treadway  
Vaile  
Vestal  
Voigt  
Volk  
Volstead  
Walters  
Ward  
Wason  
Watson  
Webster  
Welling  
Wheeler  
White, Kans.  
Williams  
Wilson, Ill.  
Winslow  
Wood, Ind.  
Woodyard  
Yates  
Young, N. Dak.  
Zihlman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Newton, Mo.

NOT VOTING—102.

Anderson  
Andrews, Md.  
Ayres  
Bakka  
Baer  
Blackmon  
Bland, Mo.  
Bowers  
Brinson  
Brooks, Pa.  
Brumbaugh  
Campbell, Pa.  
Candler  
Carew  
Carss  
Casey  
Clark, Fla.  
Classon  
Copley  
Costello  
Crowther  
Currie, Mich.  
Dent  
Donovan  
Dooling  
Eagan

Ellsworth  
Emerson  
Ferris  
Focht  
Gandy  
Ganly  
Goldfogle  
Goodall  
Goodwin, Ark.  
Gould  
Graham, Pa.  
Hamill  
Harrison  
Hersman  
Ireland  
James, Mich.  
Johnston, N. Y.  
Kahn  
Kennedy, Iowa  
Kennedy, R. I.  
Kettner  
Kitchin  
Kreider  
Langley  
Lehlbach  
Little

Loneragan  
Luffkin  
McCulloch  
McGlennan  
McKinley  
McLane  
Maher  
Mann, S. C.  
Mead  
Milligan  
Moon  
Mooney  
Moore, Ind.  
Morin  
Mudd  
Murphy  
Neely  
Nelson, Wis.  
Nicholls  
Olney  
Pell  
Perlman  
Rainey, Ala.  
Ramsey  
Reed, W. Va.  
Riddick

Riordan  
Robinson, N. C.  
Rowan  
Rowe  
Rucker  
Sabath  
Sanders, Ind.  
Sanders, La.  
Sanford  
Scully  
Steenerson  
Stephens, Miss.  
Stiness  
Strong, Pa.  
Sullivan  
Tague  
Tinkham  
Upshaw  
Vare  
Watkins  
Weaver  
Whaley  
White, Me.  
Wise

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. KAHN with Mr. DENT.

Mr. BOWERS with Mr. NEELY.

Mr. REED of West Virginia with Mr. MOON.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.

Mr. TINKHAM with Mr. TAGUE.

Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania with Mr. RIORDAN.

Mr. CROWTHER with Mr. FERRIS.

Mr. FOCHT with Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania.

Mr. WHITE of Maine with Mr. OLNEY.

Mr. ANDREWS of Maryland with Mr. WHALEY.

Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. CAREW.

Mr. LEHLBACH with Mr. BLAND of Missouri.

Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. WISE.

Mr. VARE with Mr. AYRES.

Mr. GOULD with Mr. WEAVER.

Mr. ANDERSON with Mr. UPSHAW.

Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. BLACKMON.

Mr. STEENERSON with Mr. HARRISON.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. EAGAN.

Mr. ROWE with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.

Mr. CLASSON with Mr. DOOLING.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana with Mr. WATKINS.

Mr. JAMES of Michigan with Mr. CANDLER.

Mr. BAER with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.

Mr. MORIN with Mr. McLANE.

Mr. EMERSON with Mr. ROWAN.

Mr. IRELAND with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania with Mr. NICHOLLS.

Mr. SANFORD with Mr. DONOVAN.

Mr. GOODALL with Mr. MOONEY.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin with Mr. BRINSON.

Mr. CURRIE of Michigan with Mr. SULLIVAN.

Mr. RIDDICK with Mr. SABATH.

Mr. McCULLOCH with Mr. CASEY.

Mr. LITTLE with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. MEAD.  
 Mr. PERLMAN with Mr. GOLDFOOLE.  
 Mr. COPLEY with Mr. GANDY.  
 Mr. KREIDER with Mr. MCGLENNON.  
 Mr. MURPHY with Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina.  
 Mr. LUFKIN with Mr. MCKINNEY.  
 Mr. RAMSEY with Mr. GANLY.  
 Mr. STINESS with Mr. MAHER.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
 The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.  
 The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. DEMPSEY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 517. An act amending an act to provide for drainage of Indian allotments of the Five Civilized Tribes, approved March 27, 1914;

H. R. 8881. An act for the relief of the First National Bank of New Carlisle, Ind.;

H. R. 7050. An act for the relief of the First State Bank of Kerrville, Kerr County, State of Texas;

H. R. 11572. An act for the relief of the John E. Moore Co.; and

H. R. 12634. An act for the relief of Wilhelm Alexanderson.  
 The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3737. An act to carry out the provisions of an act approved July 1, 1902, known as the act entitled "An act to accept, ratify, and confirm a proposed agreement submitted by the Kansas or Kaw Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes," and to provide for a settlement to Addie May Auld and Archie William Auld, who were enrolled as members of the said tribe after the lands and money of said tribe had been divided;

S. 684. An act for the payment of certain money to Albert H. Reynolds;

S. 2682. An act for the relief of Blanche Winters;

S. 4516. An act providing for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern judicial district of the State of West Virginia;

S. 4826. An act to amend section 5 of the act to incorporate the American Red Cross, approved January 5, 1905;

S. 4643. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918, as amended by the act of July 11, 1919; and

S. 4891. An act to amend section 1 of an act approved February 26, 1919, entitled "An act to fix the salaries of the clerks of the United States district courts and to provide for their office expenses, and for other purposes."

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 4434. An act for the relief of contributors of the Ellen M. Stone ransom fund; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4897. An act to amend section 9 of an act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 684. An act for the payment of certain money to Albert H. Reynolds; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4516. An act providing for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern judicial district of the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3737. An act to carry out the provisions of an act approved July 1, 1902, known as the act entitled "An act to accept, ratify, and confirm a proposed agreement submitted by the Kansas or Kaw Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes," and to provide for a settlement to Addie May Auld and Archie William Auld, who were enrolled as members of the said tribe after the lands and money of said tribe had been divided; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 4643. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918, as amended by the act of July 11, 1919; to the Committee on Education.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that January 29 they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bill:

H. R. 12502. An act providing for a report on the cost of improving and maintaining the Government boulevard on Missionary Ridge, in the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park.

#### DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GOOD, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 15962) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I desire to reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana reserves all points of order on the bill.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the Agricultural appropriation bill. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have objected to the other unanimous-consent requests, and I regret I shall have to object to this one.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma objects.

#### ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Army appropriation bill; and, pending that motion, I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] if we can agree upon the time for general debate. How much time does the gentleman desire to use?

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I have requests for about three hours. I should think we could finish the general debate in the afternoon; we could perhaps cut down the time a little.

Mr. ANTHONY. Would it be satisfactory to the gentleman to consume this afternoon in general debate, the time to be divided equally between myself and the gentleman from Mississippi, with the understanding that we take up the bill under the five-minute rule to-morrow?

Mr. SISSON. I would be very glad to do that, Mr. Speaker, if I were certain we could have a quorum; but I would not like to agree to that and then have some Members cut out when all the time was taken up by calling the roll.

Mr. ANTHONY. Would it be satisfactory to limit debate to four hours if the time is equally divided?

Mr. SISSON. That would necessitate my cutting down the time of gentlemen who have requested 20 minutes and 30 minutes, and so on. I would rather agree to make it four hours, two hours on each side, rather than take up the whole afternoon.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is agreeable to me if agreeable to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the general debate be limited to four hours, the time to be equally divided, two hours to a side. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Reserving the right to object, would the gentleman be willing to incorporate in his unanimous request the condition that all remarks be confined to the bill?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think not.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Then I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman objects. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Kansas that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Tilton] will please take the chair.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 15943, the Army appropriation bill, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Army appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.



The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15943) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill.

During the reading of the bill the following colloquies occurred:

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill for the first time be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma objects. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to prefer a unanimous-consent request. None of us is listening to the bill, and it is a waste of time to have it read. I prefer the unanimous-consent request that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with. It will take an hour and a half to read it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I am keeping up with the reading of the Clerk, and I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma objects.

Mr. MONAHAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONAHAN of Wisconsin. Would it be in order to ask that the reading clerk and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] should retire and go out to lunch? [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to prefer a unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fess). The gentleman will state his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BLANTON. As a preface to my unanimous-consent request—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I object to any preface. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. I say, as a preface to my request—

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Regular order!

Mr. BLANTON. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the House be conserved by dispensing with the further reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, this is an important bill. I have not had the opportunity heretofore to read it, and I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma objects. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order that a whole paragraph was skipped. I have been keeping up with the reading of the bill, and I think the RECORD ought to show that all of the bill has been read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to prefer a unanimous-consent request that in lieu of the useless reading of the present bill, to which no one is paying any attention, the Clerk read the very interesting story by Mr. William Shakespeare entitled "Much Ado About Nothing." [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TILSON). The Chair will not recognize the gentleman for that purpose. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair permit a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of no quorum. That is a preferential point.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask whether the bill is being read for the benefit of the Members or for the benefit of the visitors in the galleries?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and one Members present, a quorum. The Clerk will continue the reading.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, this bill makes appropriations for the Army for the fiscal year 1922. The committee that has had it under consideration has sought to provide sufficient funds for a Regular Army of 150,000 men.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 15943, the Army appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Army appropriation bill, and I move that general debate thereon be limited to four hours, to be divided equally between the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] and myself.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Is the gentleman willing to ask that the debate shall be limited to the bill?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think in view of the fact that gentlemen have already been promised time, I can not do that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas moves that general debate be limited to four hours, and the question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken; and there were on a division (demanded by Mr. McCLINTIC)—ayes 89, no 1.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point that no quorum is present. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Kansas will, when their names are called, answer "aye," and those opposed will answer "no."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 279, nays 2, answered "present" 2, not voting 146, as follows:

#### YEAS—279.

Ackerman	Chindblom	Fish	Johnson, Miss.
Almon	Christopherson	Fisher	Jones, Pa.
Anderson	Clark, Mo.	Flood	Jones, Tex.
Andrews, Md.	Cleary	Fordney	Juhl
Andrews, Nebr.	Coady	Foster	Kahn
Anthony	Cole	Frear	Kearns
Ashbrook	Collier	Freeman	Keller
Aswell	Cooper	French	Kelley, Mich.
Ayres	Crago	Fuller	Kelley, Pa.
Bacharach	Cramton	Garner	Kendall
Bankhead	Crisp	Garrett	Kiess
Barbour	Cullen	Glynn	King
Barkley	Curry, Calif.	Good	Kinkaid
Bee	Dale	Goodykoontz	Knutson
Begg	Dallinger	Graham, Ill.	Kraus
Bell	Darrow	Green, Iowa	Lanham
Benham	Davey	Greene, Mass.	Lankford
Black	Davis, Minn.	Greene, Vt.	Larsen
Bland, Va.	Davis, Tenn.	Griest	Layton
Blanton	Dempsey	Griffin	Lazaro
Boles	Dickinson, Iowa	Hadley	Leblach
Bowling	Dickinson, Mo.	Hamilton	Lesher
Box	Dominick	Hardy, Colo.	Linthicum
Brand	Doremus	Hardy, Tex.	Little
Briggs	Doughton	Hastings	Longworth
Brinson	Dowell	Hayden	Luce
Brooks, Ill.	Drane	Hernandez	Luhling
Browne	Drewry	Hersey	McAndrews
Buchanan	Dunbar	Hickey	McArthur
Burdick	Dunn	Hicks	McFadden
Burke	Dupré	Hill	McKenzie
Burroughs	Dyer	Hoch	McKeown
Butler	Echols	Hoey	McLeod
Byrnes, S. C.	Edmonds	Houghton	McPherson
Byrnes, Tenn.	Elliot	Howard	MacGregor
Caldwell	Elston	Hudspeth	Madden
Campbell, Kans.	Esch	Hull, Iowa	Magee
Cannon	Evans, Mont.	Humphreys	Major
Cantrill	Evans, Nebr.	Igoe	Mann, Ill.
Caraway	Fairfield	James, Va.	Mansfield
Carss	Fess	Jeffers	Mapes
Carter	Fields	Johnson, Ky.	Mason

Merritt	Raker	Small	Timberlake
Michener	Ramseyer	Smith, Idaho	Towner
Miller	Randall, Calif.	Smith, Ill.	Treadway
Minahan, N. J.	Randall, Wis.	Smith, Mich.	Vaile
Mondell	Ransley	Smith, N. Y.	Vestal
Moore, Ohio	Rayburn	Smithwick	Vinson
Moore, Va.	Reavis	Snell	Volk
Mott	Reber	Snyder	Volstead
Neely	Reed, N. Y.	Steagall	Walsh
Newton, Minn.	Rhodes	Stedman	Walters
Newton, Mo.	Ricketts	Stephens, Ohio	Wason
O'Connell	Robinson, N. C.	Stevenson	Watson
O'Connor	Robison, Ky.	Stiness	Webster
Ogden	Rodenberg	Stull	Welling
Oldfield	Rogers	Strong, Kans.	Welty
Oliver	Romjue	Summers, Wash.	Wheeler
Osborne	Rose	Summers, Tex.	Williams
Overstreet	Rouse	Sweet	Wilson, Ill.
Padgett	Sanders, La.	Swindall	Wilson, La.
Paige	Sanders, N. Y.	Swope	Wingo
Park	Schall	Taylor, Ark.	Winslow
Parrish	Scott	Taylor, Colo.	Wood, Ind.
Patterson	Sherwood	Taylor, Tenn.	Woods, Va.
Peters	Shreve	Temple	Woodyard
Phelan	Siegel	Thomas	Wright
Pou	Sinclair	Thompson	Young, N. Dak.
Quin	Sisson	Tillman	Zihlman
Radcliffe	Slemp	Tilson	

## NAYS—2.

McClintic Sears

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Huddleston Stephens, Miss.

## NOT VOTING—146.

Babka	Gard	Lufkin	Reed, W. Va.
Baer	Godwin, N. C.	McCulloch	Riddick
Benson	Goldfogle	McDuffie	Riordan
Blackmon	Goodall	McGlennnon	Rowan
Bland, Ind.	Goodwin, Ark.	McKiniry	Rowe
Bland, Mo.	Gould	McKinley	Rubey
Bowers	Graham, Pa.	McLane	Rucker
Britten	Hamill	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sabath
Brooks, Pa.	Harrell	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sanders, Ind.
Brumbaugh	Harrison	Maher	Sanford
Campbell, Pa.	Haugen	Mann, S. C.	Scully
Candler	Hawley	Martin	Sells
Carew	Hays	Mays	Sims
Casey	Hersman	Mead	Sinnot
Clark, Fla.	Holland	Milligan	Steele
Classon	Hulings	Monahan, Wis.	Steenerson
Connally	Hull, Tenn.	Montague	Strong, Pa.
Copley	Husted	Moon	Sullivan
Costello	Hutchinson	Mooney	Tague
Crowther	Ireland	Moore, Ind.	Tincher
Currie, Mich.	Jacoway	Morin	Tinkham
Denison	James, Mich.	Mudd	Upshaw
Dent	Johnson, S. Dak.	Murphy	Vare
Dewalt	Johnson, Wash.	Nelson, Mo.	Venable
Donovan	Johnston, N. Y.	Nelson, Wis.	Voigt
Dooling	Kennedy, Iowa	Nicholls	Ward
Eagan	Kennedy, R. I.	Nolan	Watkins
Eagle	Kettner	Olney	Weaver
Ellsworth	Kincheloe	Parker	Whaley
Emerson	Kitchin	Pell	White, Kans.
Evans, Nev.	Klecza	Perlman	White, Me.
Ferris	Kreider	Porter	Wilson, Pa.
Focht	Lampert	Purnell	Wise
Gallagher	Langley	Rainey, Ala.	Yates
Gallivan	Lea, Calif.	Rainey, Henry T.	Young, Tex.
Gandy	Lee, Ga.	Rainey, John W.	
Ganly	Loneragan	Ramsey	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Mr. VARE with Mr. STEELE.

Mr. HUSTED with Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. CONNALLY.

Mr. LAMPERT with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. MCKINLEY with Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas with Mr. VENABLE.

Mr. YATES with Mr. MONTAGUE.

Mr. HAWLEY with Mr. GALLIVAN.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan with Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY.

Mr. PURNELL with Mr. JACOWAY.

Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. BENSON.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana with Mr. GARD.

Mr. KLECZKA with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.

Mr. SINNOTT with Mr. RUBEY.

Mr. PARKER with Mr. YOUNG of Texas.

Mr. VOIGT with Mr. SIMS.

Mr. MONAHAN of Wisconsin with Mr. HOLLAND.

Mr. BAER with Mr. WHALEY.

Mr. BOWERS with Mr. BABKA.

Mr. HULINGS with Mr. KINCHELOE.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota with Mr. LEA of California.

Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. EAGLE.

Mr. WARD with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.

Mr. TINCHER with Mr. MAYS.

Mr. RAMSEY with Mr. LEE of Georgia.

Mr. NELSON of Missouri with Mr. McDUFFIE.

Mr. NOLAN with Mr. RAKER.

Mr. PORTER with Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. SELLS with Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURPHY with Mr. HAMILL.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington with Mr. HULL of Tennessee.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska with Mr. DENT.

Mr. DENISON with Mr. EVANS of Nevada.

Mr. HAYS with Mr. GANLY.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. PELL.

Mr. HARRELD with Mr. UPSHAW.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

On motion of Mr. ANTHONY, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Army appropriation bill (H. R. 15943) with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, in response to the demand of the people of this country, and in accord with the sentiment of the membership of this House, the Committee on Appropriations in reporting this bill have materially reduced the amount which has heretofore been appropriated for the maintenance of the Army. We are going to try to put an end to some of the waste and extravagance which has characterized the conduct of the Military Establishment in recent years. In reducing to the sum which is appropriated for the maintenance of the Military Establishment, I do not believe we will impair to any serious degree any of the many activities of that great organization.

The War Department in their estimates asked for the appropriation of \$694,000,000. This committee has reported to the House a bill which will give the War Department approximately \$328,000,000 for the conduct of the Army for the next fiscal year. For the current year there was appropriated the sum of \$390,000,000 for the Military Establishment. It was the intention of this House, then, to appropriate for an Army of 175,000 men. We are advised by the Chief of Finance that there will be a deficit in the pay of the Army in the amount appropriated for that purpose the current year, for an Army of 175,000 men, of about \$25,000,000, and that there will be a total deficiency this year of over \$100,000,000, so that the total cost of the Military Establishment for the current year will be about \$494,000,000. We propose to conduct it the next year at a total cost of about \$331,000,000, including both the Army and the West Point Military Academy, which has heretofore been carried as a separate appropriation bill, but which this year has been included in the Army appropriation bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are providing for an Army of 150,000 enlisted men in the Regular Establishment. This is really an Army of 160,000, because we also provide for about 6,500 Philippine Scouts, and there are authorized in the reorganization bill 2,500 flying cadets, for whom provision is made, so that we are practically providing for an Army of 160,000.

Now, the criticism has been made that it will be impossible to get the Regular Establishment down to a basis of 150,000 men during the next fiscal year. The committee have carefully investigated the facts again, and we do not believe there is the slightest doubt that the Army can be easily reduced from its present total of about 234,000 men to 150,000 men during the next fiscal year and that 150,000 men will be ample to provide properly for all the military requirements of the Nation.

It is contended that 234,000 men are now enlisted in the Army and that we can not get rid of them in time to cut down our force to 150,000 men during the next fiscal year. Now, this number of enlisted men is made up of about 60 per cent three-year enlistments and about 40 per cent one-year enlistments. Investigations made so far by the General Staff develop the fact that there will be no trouble in bringing the Army down by July next to the 175,000 men required by the resolution which the House passed the other day demanding that the War Department reduce to that number. But if we simply cease enlisting, and permit the one-year men at the expiration of their enlistment to go out of the Army, and if we further liberalize the regulations, which are now very drastic, and prevent any man from getting out of the Army of his own free will after he has enlisted, except by reason of death or dependency—if we liberalize those regulations, there will be enough men who will want to go out of the Army so that the number can be reduced easily to the 150,000 men for whom we provide.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Of this 150,000 or 160,000 men whom the gentleman speaks of I would like to ask, will any appreciable number of them be privates?

Mr. ANTHONY. Quite a large number of them, of course, will be privates. But I will say to the gentleman that we are



appropriating in this bill for 14,000 commissioned officers, not that we have any desire to limit the number of commissioned officers provided in the reorganization bill, which was 17,000, but because we think 14,000 is the number that there will be of commissioned officers in the next fiscal year, and included in that number are a large body of men who were emergency officers during the war, practically all of whom have had training in actual warfare under modern battle conditions, and their retention in the military service is one of the greatest and one of the most reasonable assets along the line of military preparedness that we can provide for at this time.

We are taking into the Regular service over 5,000 emergency officers, men trained in the late war and now given commissions in the Regular service, and they, with the officers already commissioned, make up this total of 14,000.

We must not lose sight of the fact that, in addition to these 150,000 men of the Regular Establishment, liberal provision is being made for the growth of the National Guard. It now numbers nearly 100,000 men. We figure that it will expand to 125,000 or 140,000 during the next fiscal year; and if the National Guard can have sympathetic treatment at the hands of the War Department, and be permitted to grow and expand under the provisions of the law, it will easily reach the maximum for which that law provides and make a very efficient and strong second line of military defense in this country.

We must also not lose sight of the fact that back of the Regular Army and back of this National Guard are the millions of trained men, the veteran soldiers who come to us as a result of the Great War, who also form a tremendous asset along the line of military preparedness.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Upon what theory of consistency does the Committee on Appropriations provide for an Army of 150,000 men, when only a few days ago both branches of Congress passed a resolution fixing the minimum Army at 175,000 enlisted men?

Mr. ANTHONY. Along the lines of economy and reducing the public expenditures at this time.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. SISSON. If the gentleman will permit, the House did not have an opportunity to vote on an Army of 150,000 men. We were left to the one proposition of voting for 175,000 or voting to leave the Army where it is now, because that resolution was brought up under a suspension of the rules.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is correct.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. And we did not fix a minimum of 175,000. We fixed a maximum of 175,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is equivalent to a minimum.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say that there is no attempt in this bill to arbitrarily fix a maximum, except that we are appropriating an amount that will pay 150,000 men and 14,000 officers.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. How many men does the gentleman expect to be in the Army the 1st day of July of this year?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think there will be about 175,000, if the War Department will go to work wholeheartedly toward reducing the number of men.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. They are not going to work at it at present. I understand that they are still recruiting and that you are paying \$90 bonus for every man that you can reenlist.

Mr. ANTHONY. Does the gentleman mean that we are paying it or that the War Department is paying it?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The War Department; and you are appropriating the money and paying \$90 to-day for a man to reenlist, and yet the gentleman admits that he is going to reduce the Army when the Army is increasing all of the time.

Mr. ANTHONY. After March 4 I guarantee to the gentleman that the Army will be reduced, and rapidly reduced. [Applause.]

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Would it not be a good plan to pass some provision by which we could stop enlistments and reenlistments?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think that was the intention of the House when it passed the resolution introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

Mr. HULL of Iowa. It might have been the intention, but the resolution did not stop it. The gentleman understands that.

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; but I have a report in my pocket from the General Staff that says that the Army can be reduced to

175,000 men by July, and I take it that it is the intention of the department to so reduce it.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The Adjutant General says that the most that they can do is to cut it down to 199,000 by the 1st of July.

Mr. ANTHONY. Let me say to the gentleman that even though the department does not act fully in accordance with the resolution passed by the House and the Senate, even though they do not arbitrarily refuse to reenlist men whose enlistments expire and who are asking for it, yet I say the next administration has the power under the articles of enlistment that are signed by every enlisted man to discharge any enlisted man or as many enlisted men as it may please at any time.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Would the gentleman advocate such a step?

Mr. ANTHONY. I certainly would, if necessary.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. HUSTED. Does this bill provide for the retention of all of these emergency officers who have been commissioned in the Regular Army, but whose appointments have not yet been confirmed?

Mr. ANTHONY. It does take care of all appointments to the commissioned grades which are now pending in the Senate.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I was much interested in the statement of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] that he thought the National Guard would be increased materially if it could receive the sympathetic attitude of the War Department. Will the gentleman be kind enough to inform us whether the matter under existing law is dependent upon the sympathetic attitude of the War Department? I think we would like to know just exactly what the situation is in regard to that.

Mr. ANTHONY. I am sorry to say that that has been the case heretofore. I do not think it is any secret; it is known to anyone who has kept tab on military matters in this country, that ever since the armistice it has been the determined policy of the War Department to try to kill off the National Guard. The National Guard were discharged wholesale when they returned from France with the idea that they would go completely out of existence as individuals and as organizations, and it has only been due to the fact that the returning soldiers who came back from France, who were members of the National Guard organizations which distinguished themselves over there, made up their minds that they would perpetuate their organizations and continue them in the National Guard of the United States, and the War Department has been compelled to permit a certain number of them to qualify as national guardsmen.

The War Department has imposed in my opinion serious handicaps to the reorganization of the guard, handicaps because they are insisting that each State must organize the guard along the same lines as the Regular Army, insisting that each State shall establish technical units of the National Guard which are expensive and difficult to organize, instead of permitting them to organize along natural lines of infantry organization, which is not only the most popular and most effective but costs much less money to maintain.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield first to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from Kansas if it is not only fair to say of the War Department that in discharging the National Guard from the Federal service there was no law in existence at the time whereby the National Guard of the various States could be returned to their former status as national guardsmen, but that defect has since been cured by legislation. Is not that true?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think they could have avoided that step, because, if the gentleman will remember, it was the gentleman from Illinois, himself, who offered an amendment to one of the war bills enacted by this Congress to the effect that the organizations which went into the Federal service during the war from the various States should be maintained in their entirety as such organizations. That amendment and that law were absolutely ignored by the War Department, and they had the idea then in mind of disorganizing the guard by refusing to obey the law. I yield now to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. FIELDS. Has there not been a feeling on the part of the National Guard for many years that they did not have the sympathetic cooperation of the War Department?

Mr. ANTHONY. There is no question about that.

Mr. FIELDS. I submit this observation in order to correct an impression which the gentleman made a while ago that this

has been just since the armistice. Is it not a fact that it dates back many years?

Mr. ANTHONY. As the gentleman will recall, a great many years before the war, when we sat on the Committee on Military Affairs, many officers of the Regular Establishment were wont to come before us and belittle the National Guard—

Mr. FIELDS. And under former administrations—

Mr. ANTHONY (continuing). But the Congress has always stood by the guard, and the guard has vindicated upon the battle fields of France the good opinion we had of them as they have invariably done when called upon to perform service. [Applause.]

Mr. FIELDS. And this has existed under former administrations as well as under the present administration?

Mr. ANTHONY. That is quite true.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Does the gentleman have in mind any legislative policy that can be established after the 4th of March to change the sympathy of the War Department toward the National Guard?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes. We have already made such provision. The Committee on Military Affairs last year in its reorganization act provided that the Chief of the Militia Bureau should be a National Guard officer selected by the governors of the States. The War Department has made such appointment of a National Guard officer, but I am very sorry to say they did not listen to the recommendations of the governors of the States.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield for a question on another point?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Can the gentleman state, approximately, how many emergency officers of the war are retained in the Army now and come within the numbers of those who were confirmed last Saturday by the Senate?

Mr. ANTHONY. About 5,200, as I remember.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. That is the total number of confirmations.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is the total number of emergency officers appointed to the Regular Army.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If the gentleman will yield further, that is about the total number of confirmations made by the Senate; I figured they averaged about that, but I understood many of those appointments confirmed by the Senate were men already in the Regular Army line.

Mr. ANTHONY. I am not familiar with that.

Mr. FISHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to ask the gentleman whether the committee in drafting the bill made an investigation as to what effect the varying policies of the Government as to the number of enlisted men will have on the efficiency of the War Department? For instance, we first passed a bill fixing 280,000 as the number of enlisted men of the Army. Then the appropriation bill appropriated, as it was claimed, for an Army of 175,000, or 10 per cent under 175,000, and it was claimed on the floor of the House that the Secretary violated the instructions of the Congress in enlisting over 175,000. Now we come with 150,000, all within a few months' time, and I would like to know whether or not the committee has investigated that and whether it would not have a serious effect on the efficiency of the Army?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say that one of the members of the committee which framed this bill has investigated and has reason to believe that the number of men that this Congress appropriates for to compose the Army of the United States during the next fiscal year will be faithfully adhered to and observed by the Government after the 4th of March.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not know whether the gentleman desires to discuss it at this time or not, but I am interested in the matter of the return home of the soldiers in Germany. If the gentleman does not desire to discuss that now I will take it up later, but I would like to have some information about that.

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not think our committee has official information in regard to when the men who compose the army of occupation on the Rhine will be returned, but the Secretary of War tells us that he has initiated the policy of no longer sending any replacements over there with the idea that ultimately they would return. And the committee has assumed

that the army that is now in Germany will be returned at an early date.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. MILLER. For a question. What was the basis for fixing the number at 150,000 men? Why not 125,000 or 175,000? How did the committee come to arrive at the number of 150,000?

Mr. ANTHONY. The number was fixed after a careful study of the actual requirements of the country. We took into consideration the number of men who would be required to garrison our outlying possessions and the number of men necessary to be maintained in garrisons in this country, including the Coast Artillery for our fortifications, a force on the border, and for the various military posts in this country—

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield for another short question?

Mr. ANTHONY. And we concluded that 150,000 was about the right number.

Mr. MILLER. Did the gentleman's committee take into consideration the world's condition, or did it fix it entirely upon conditions within the United States?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; we took into consideration every condition, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER. How did the gentleman arrive at the world's condition, through what sources of information, as to form a basis of the United States Army?

Mr. ANTHONY. We made up our minds that the probability was very small that this country would be called upon to participate in any foreign war, and we figured on the size of an Army that would be most proper for the purposes of the defense of this country and for the maintenance of domestic peace and order.

Mr. MILLER. Minimizing the chances of any increase of the Army because of the world's condition, you probably allowed the Army sufficient to meet the demand within the United States?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think so. And let me go further in answer to the gentleman and say if we should be called upon to participate in any great world's war that to-day this country is better prepared, from a military standpoint, than any other nation on the face of the earth. We have more guns, cannon, artillery of all kinds, and of the most modern kind, built and in storage, than any other nation in the world, and we have more ammunition than those 10,000 or 12,000 big field guns can fire off in about 20 years.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will permit me, in answer to the gentleman I would like to state that my idea as to the committee fixing this Army at 150,000 men or 160,000 men was to fix at least 10 men to each officer, that they had already provided for, and which personnel they could not change.

Mr. MILLER. I did not seek information from the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. I wanted to get some definite information.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think the gentleman from Texas needs a course of instruction at the hands of the Military Committee. The duties of the commissioned officers in our Army for the next few years will not be entirely confined to officering the different regiments and organizations. We find that it is going to take for the purposes of military training in this country at schools and colleges 1,000 officers. It will take another 1,000 to train the National Guard. It will take another thousand for vocational-training purposes, and hundreds of them will be required in many other activities away from their regiments, to say nothing of the work of educating the officers themselves. The commissioned force of the Army will be very busy during the next few years.

Mr. BLANTON. I knew the gentleman would find something for them to do, because they are already here.

Mr. KAHN. If the gentleman will permit, I wish to say that quite a number of the bureaus in the War Department have nothing but officers. There are no privates in those departments at all—such as the Judge Advocate General and the Inspector General Departments—and perhaps that would make the average of officers to the enlisted personnel much larger.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. On the basis of 150,000 men for your Army, what will the strength of the Infantry be?

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not think the committee has figured out the strength of the different organizations. That is a matter which we would leave to the War Department.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. You do not mean to say that you have come before Congress and have not figured on the strength of the different branches of the Army?

Mr. ANTHONY. I suppose it will be based on the strength of the branches as fixed in the reorganization act. The gentle-



man knows that. Now, if we reduce the Army, I presume it will keep it in the same relative proportion.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. And what is that relative proportion?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will refer the gentleman to his committee's bill, which the gentleman helped to prepare.

Mr. FIELDS. The committee by limiting the appropriation has reduced the enlisted personnel about 47 per cent. What per cent of decrease has it made in the commissioned personnel?

Mr. ANTHONY. It has made no attempt to decrease the commissioned personnel.

Mr. FIELDS. So it will be as great for an Army of 150,000 men as was provided for an Army of 280,000 men? Are we to so understand?

Mr. ANTHONY. No. The War Department has authority to commission seventeen thousand and some hundred of officers, if it is desired.

Mr. FIELDS. That is not impaired?

Mr. ANTHONY. It is not impaired by anything in this bill.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is it not a fact, I will ask the gentleman from Kansas, in speaking of the number of commissioned officers of the Army it is very apt to mislead almost anyone not thoroughly familiar with the Military Establishment, for the reason that the preachers and the doctors and the veterinarians and the dentists are all classed as commissioned officers? And when you think of the number as a whole it is confusing in taking into consideration men commissioned to lead the fighting?

Mr. FIELDS. Will it require as many doctors and preachers for 150,000 men as for 280,000?

Mr. McKENZIE. I will say to the gentleman, if the gentleman from Kansas will permit, that the Surgeon General of the Army contends that he ought to have his full quota of 6½ per cent of officers for the entire authorized enlisted strength of the Army, regardless of how many enlisted men there are.

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield for another suggestion?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. FIELDS. Is it not a fact that under your Army reorganization bill passed last fall, followed by the legislation that you are now adopting with limitation, you have got an Army that is top-heavy with its commissioned personnel?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think not.

Mr. DUNBAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield.

Mr. DUNBAR. Can the gentleman tell the House the cost in the present year of maintaining an army of occupation on the Rhine?

Mr. ANTHONY. I can not give the cost for the present year, but it was developed before the committee that the total cost of maintaining the army on the Rhine up to December 4, as I remember it, was \$277,000,000, and of that amount the German Government has paid about \$34,000,000 on account.

Mr. DUNBAR. Did that include the calendar year or the fiscal year?

Mr. ANTHONY. It was the total amount from the time that our Army moved into Germany down to last month.

Mr. DUNBAR. Another question, please. If the next administration declares the war with Germany to be at an end, those soldiers will be withdrawn and there will be that much money saved?

Mr. ANTHONY. There will.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman permit? That will depend upon the terms of the resolution in which peace is declared, will it not? This is a rather interesting question. If peace is declared, the provisions of the treaty will still be in effect. I do not know whether the soldiers would be withdrawn or not.

If peace is declared by resolution, I should suppose that the resolution would fix whether or not the troops are going to be withdrawn. The gentleman would not want to commit himself on that?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say to the gentleman that the committee has gone on the assumption that the army of occupation in Germany will be entirely withdrawn at a very early date.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. QUIN. The cost of \$270,000,000 for the army that we have in Germany up to the 1st of January was for how long a period of time? Was it from the time we put them there up to that date?

Mr. ANTHONY. Wait a minute and I will give it to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIN. And therefore I would like to know the number of men we have there now, and what the average has been which has aggregated that enormous sum of \$270,000,000.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say to the gentleman that the first charge was for the month of December, 1918, when the cost was \$34,344,000. The German Government paid \$6,770,000 that month. Then during the year 1919 the bills were made in three periods—one of \$113,000,000, one of \$16,000,000, and one of \$25,000,000. The German Government made two payments on that, one of \$8,000,000 and one of \$14,000,000. In 1920 there were two charges, one of \$7,000,000 on March 31 and one of \$7,000,000 on June 30. The German Government made two payments, one of \$1,300,000 and one of \$1,000,000, making the total charges of \$257,000,000 and total payments \$32,000,000, leaving a balance in favor of the United States on June 30 of \$225,000,000. Of course, that has increased very considerably since.

Mr. QUIN. At the close of the session of Congress last year I read a letter from the Secretary of War to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, which did not get into the Record, which showed that it cost \$25,000 a year for each one of those soldiers that we have over there. I want to know whether that is correct, and whether it is still costing that much, and why such an enormous charge as that should be charged for the maintenance of those soldiers?

Mr. ANTHONY. Under the terms of the armistice the German Government is supposed to pay the expense of the American army of occupation.

Mr. QUIN. Admitting that to be true, how can this Government charge such outrageous sums for the maintenance of a soldier in Germany as compared with the cost of maintaining him in the United States?

Mr. ANTHONY. We have not the exact figures, but I will say that all of the cost of the maintenance of the army of occupation in Germany is included in the appropriation bills that Congress has passed from year to year for the support of the Regular Army, and there were items included in the estimates for this bill for that purpose, but we eliminated them entirely from the estimates when we framed this bill.

Mr. DUNBAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to make a suggestion to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; I will yield first to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, before we get entirely away from the 150,000 Army, I would like to ask this question: I think most people visualize an army from the number of men who carry guns. How many of the 150,000 men would be actually field men, carrying guns?

Mr. ANTHONY. There are a very large number in the different special corps of the Army. I will try to give the gentleman the figures here. I will try to hunt that up later, but I would say that there would be 40,000, anyway, in the different special corps.

Mr. SNYDER. Then there would be 40,000 out of the 150,000 that would be actually mobile troops?

Mr. ANTHONY. No. There would be about 110,000 or 120,000.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KAHN. The testimony before the Committee on Military Affairs covering a period of years was that of the enlisted personnel of every 10 men 6 were in the combat service and 4 in the auxiliary.

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes. I am obliged to the gentleman.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Is it not true that if you put your Army at 150,000, you will not have quite 60,000 in the Infantry?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will tell the gentleman that I know nothing in regard to the details upon which any sized Army would be made up during the next fiscal year.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I think the answer to the question is that you would have less than 60,000 actual Infantry carrying arms.

Mr. SNYDER. That is exactly what I wanted to bring out.

Mr. SIGSON. Oh, Mr. Chairman, that is not exactly a fair statement.

Mr. ANTHONY. You have Field Artillery, and you have Coast Artillery, Cavalry, Engineers, Signal Corps, tank, chemical, and other fighting units, which would run the number of fighting men up to 110,000 or 115,000 men out of the total of 150,000.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I would like to ask another question. I am somewhat mystified myself in trying to get at the exact

figures that the War Department is putting out. Since the gentleman has informed me I am still more mystified. The gentleman spoke of having 175,000 in the Army on the 1st of July. I have before me in the hearings on the deficiency bill, page 232, the testimony of Gen. Lord, estimating the strength of the Army and putting it at the 1st of August at 200,411. I do not understand these different sets of figures. I had one the other day which was corrected in a very short time by the War Department, so that I think most of them are guessing.

Mr. ANTHONY. I advise the gentleman not to base any of his theories upon figures that come from the War Department. [Laughter.]

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. FISHER. I was very much interested in the gentleman's statement as to the policy of the incoming administration concerning the disposition of the army of occupation. Can the gentleman give us any information as to when they will be brought home?

Mr. ANTHONY. We have no knowledge as to when.

Mr. FISHER. And I will ask the gentleman under what conditions they will be brought home? Will they be summarily brought home?

Mr. ANTHONY. I can not answer that.

Mr. FISHER. Can we anticipate a further reduction in the number of enlisted men in the Army when the army of occupation is brought home?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think so. After March 4 you can rest assured all these things will happen.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. I would like to ask the gentleman if the soldiers now in Germany may be looked upon as voluntarily there?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think most of them have enlisted for foreign service. In fact, I understand that the service in Germany is very popular, because the American dollar is worth a vastly larger sum when computed in German marks.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. While we were considering the Army reorganization bill last summer I asked the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] how many men we had in Germany and how much it cost per day to maintain that army abroad. In response to the question I asked him to read a letter from the Secretary of War indicating that the cost since the armistice was signed would average \$1,220,000 a day. That being carried to its logical conclusion would result in about \$1,000,000,000 of expense since the armistice was signed, for the army over there, as against the figures now given by the War Department to the subcommittee having charge of this bill.

Mr. DUNBAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. No; let me finish my question. Now, I should like to know whether or not the information in possession of the gentleman's subcommittee covers the questions that were involved in the colloquy that took place between the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] and myself at that time.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. First I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan and then to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CRAMTON. Let me call attention to these figures that were before the committee, that in the month of December, 1918, the cost was \$34,000,000, which would be a little over a million dollars a day; whereas in the three months from April to June of this year it was \$7,000,000, a much smaller figure per day, due probably to the reduction of the force.

Mr. ANTHONY. Now I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman will recall that immediately after that first letter of the Secretary of War was read to the House he followed it with another letter saying that it was that amount while the great number of soldiers were in the occupied territory, and I think he referred to the fact that we had as many as 250,000 soldiers in the occupied territory then, but that the cost had fallen as the men were brought home, and I think he gave the exact cost that was being paid by Germany at that time.

Mr. MADDEN. So that as a matter of fact the figures that are now reported by the department to the Appropriations Committee do not tell the exact story, and it amounts to a good deal more money than what it seems to amount to on its face.

Mr. ANTHONY. I might say for the gentleman's information that we were assured by the War Department at the beginning of our hearings on this bill that the amount of the expense of the maintenance of our Army in Germany had been paid in

full, and it was only after further questions that we found that such was not the case.

Mr. MADDEN. I think if the matter were more thoroughly investigated it would be found that we have gone to an expense of \$1,000,000,000 to maintain the American Army in occupied German territory since the armistice was signed.

Mr. CRAMTON. If my colleague will yield in that connection, as illustrating the force of the chairman's statement a moment ago as to the reliability of the information derived from the War Department, in the beginning of the hearings, when Gen. March, Chief of Staff, was before the subcommittee and asked about the payment for maintenance of the army of occupation in Germany, he used this language in response to a question:

I went into it with Gen. Allen, and he said he had on hand enough marks daily to pay the current expenses of the American troops there. Of course, the transportation problem is still on us. Germany will perhaps pay for it in the long run, but the running expenses day by day have been paid for some time and the marks have always been forthcoming.

Mr. ANTHONY. Have the marks been figured at their present market value?

Gen. MARCH. I do not know about that. But there is no trouble about payment; the American troops are paid right along.

Mr. CRAMTON. You mean that at Coblenz the local bills are rendered in marks and paid in marks?

Gen. MARCH. Exactly so.

Then, later in the hearing, the fact developed that only one-seventh at the most had been paid.

Mr. KAHN. The American soldiers have been paid, as I understand it, but this country has paid them, and Germany has not paid them, although Germany agreed to pay them at the time of the signing of the armistice.

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I see from the hearings that we have about 16,000 soldiers in Germany now. Can the gentleman state how definite our obligation is to maintain an army there? I notice the Secretary says he expects to reduce the force to about 8,000 by December, so it would seem that we are under no exact contract and have incurred no very well-defined obligation. If that is true, why should not Congress enact legislation that will dispose of that situation by providing for a return of the troops, if it will be in violation of no agreement? [Applause.]

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say to the gentleman that the committee does not know definitely just how many troops we agreed to maintain in Germany, but we did get the impression that more troops had been sent to Germany than our original agreement provided for.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Does not the gentleman think that somebody ought to ascertain what the facts are in order that we may enact such legislation as may be proper and desirable?

Mr. ANTHONY. There will be no necessity for enacting it, because the troops will probably be back by the time Congress could act.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. We have waited for a statement from the department and have done nothing when we might have acted if action was admissible.

Mr. MADDEN. The President vetoed the resolution that was passed that would have enabled these troops to be brought back.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. By no means, if the provisions of the armistice fix our obligation, and not the treaty.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I have been endeavoring to ascertain the number of civilian employees in the Army. Has the chairman determined that question?

Mr. ANTHONY. That has been a mooted question. The statement has been made frequently that with the Army as now constituted for every two enlisted men there is a civilian employee. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], a member of the committee, went into that question very thoroughly and developed that there are now in the Army 102,000 civilian employees.

Mr. CRAMTON. As illustrating a further fact, the statement of the chairman is correct from information we received two days ago, but to-day it has been reduced about 10,000.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. Will the gentleman tell us something about the policy which this bill provides for training in colleges?

Mr. ANTHONY. This bill provides for the continuation of training in schools and colleges and appropriates \$3,000,000 for



that purpose. There are now 100,000 young men receiving military training in schools and colleges under what are called the Reserve Officers Training Corps provisions of the bill. We propose to give them enough money so that they can keep up this activity to the fullest extent.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. KNUTSON. The question was brought up about occupation—there are two brigades in Germany at the present time, are there not?

Mr. ANTHONY. There is supposed to be a division, possibly made up of three brigades.

Mr. KNUTSON. There is a second brigade, known as the Silesian brigade, supposed to police that country while the plebiscite was held, but it has never been called into action. Why has not this Silesian brigade been called home?

Mr. ANTHONY. The troops for Silesia were dispatched from this country. When they reached the other side there was some objection to their going into Silesia.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why were they not brought back to this country?

Mr. ANTHONY. They were not brought back under the policy of the War Department.

Mr. KNUTSON. The Silesian brigade is in excess of the number that we agreed to maintain in Germany under the armistice.

Mr. ANTHONY. That probably is true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to get a little light on this matter in regard to how this bill was constructed. It was framed by a subcommittee of five members, of which the gentleman was chairman. Was it afterwards submitted to the full committee?

Mr. ANTHONY. It was submitted to the full committee and debated and discussed considerably.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the gentleman care to state whether any changes were made?

Mr. ANTHONY. There were several changes made in the bill, minor changes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. How long was the bill discussed by the full committee?

Mr. ANTHONY. About two hours, and it was considered about two months in the subcommittee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that, but what I wanted to find out was how much the whole committee considered it.

Mr. ANTHONY. The subcommittee felt highly complimented when it was found that except for three amendments made in the bill its work was approved by the whole committee.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Do I understand that this committee is willing to defend the policy of discharging a man who has a written contract with the Government to serve for three years? I understood him to say that they were going to discharge some.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say that if it is necessary to make public expenditures come down within the limits of the receipts of the Treasury, such a step is fully justified.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Does not the gentleman think that it would have been a better plan for the committee to have first stopped the enlistments and stopped paying \$90 for a man that you are now going to discharge?

Mr. ANTHONY. Undoubtedly this House should have taken action in December and put a stop to further enlistments. I want to give due credit to the gentleman from Iowa, as I understand he introduced a bill calling for such action, and I am sorry he did not get action on it sooner.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I would like to inquire why the gentleman's committee did not act. He will remember that about the 1st of December I called his attention to the fact that this ought to be done, and he said that his committee was going to attend to it.

Mr. ANTHONY. I consulted with the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, and we found that, it being a legislative matter, it very properly belonged to the gentleman's committee. [Laughter.]

Mr. HULL of Iowa. You may have talked with the chairman of the committee, but you told me it could be quickly accomplished by putting it on a deficiency bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa will observe the rules of the House.

Mr. ANTHONY. The gentleman from Iowa seems to question the right and authority of the War Department to discharge a man before his term of enlistment expires. That seems to be running through his questions. I will ask him if he ever

read the articles of enlistment. If he has he will find that the language says the man is enlisted for a specific term of years unless sooner discharged by the Secretary of War. So there is no contract that binds us to keep a man for a term of three years.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I understand that, but we have never done that.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOWELL. The gentleman has intimated that 14,000 officers are more than is necessary for 150,000 men.

Mr. ANTHONY. For the purpose of line officers.

Mr. DOWELL. What will the officers do who are not needed as officers of the Army?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say that nearly every one of them will be put to some useful work. A large proportion of them will be occupied for the next few years in the development of their own military education.

Mr. DOWELL. How many officers are there in the service at the present time?

Mr. ANTHONY. Thirteen thousand one hundred.

Mr. DOWELL. Are they all in the city of Washington? [Laughter.]

Mr. ANTHONY. Oh, no; I think there are about 1,000 here.

Mr. DOWELL. The reason I make the inquiry is because they are disposing of millions of dollars' worth of property in some of the camps, and in one I know of the highest officer there is a lieutenant, and I assume that the most of them are here in Washington and that they have no one of special rank to attend to this special service.

Mr. ANTHONY. If the gentleman will read some of the paragraphs of this bill before the House, he will see that this committee intends to put many of these officers to work.

Mr. DOWELL. If that is possible, I hope the gentleman will succeed.

Mr. KNUTSON. What kind of work?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Answering the problem raised by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL], I want to say that if the War Department now would discharge all of the men in the Army who want to be discharged they could reduce the personnel down to at least 75,000 men.

Mr. ANTHONY. The gentleman is quite right about that.

Mr. BLANTON. The point is that the Secretary is holding them when he has no right to do it.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield, although I want to conclude my remarks in about five minutes.

Mr. MacGREGOR. On this proposition of motor vehicles does not the committee think they could have gone to a greater extent in stopping the Army from rolling around on wheels? Practically \$5,000,000 are provided for gasoline in this bill.

Mr. ANTHONY. Is the gentleman referring to the appropriation for gasoline?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Yes; about \$5,000,000.

Mr. ANTHONY. About \$3,000,000 of that is provided for the Air Service. The Air Service used about three and a half million dollars' worth of gasoline in the past year.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Did not the Congress pass a resolution prohibiting officers from joy riding around in these cars?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; and I think that has been largely done away with.

Mr. KNUTSON. I passed seven or eight of them in Rock Creek Park on Sunday.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Is it not a fact that this provision for 14,000 officers is also made because in the event of an emergency the officers are the desirable contingents in the Army?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; because these officers are already trained. They have actual war experience, and it has been demonstrated during the late war that we can raise an effective enlisted force within a very few months' time.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. How many men are to be in the Air Service?

Mr. ANTHONY. The number has not been arbitrarily fixed. There are now 9,000 enlisted men in the Air Service. That number will have to be reduced, if we reduce the total of enlisted men.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. How many civilians will there be in the Air Service?

Mr. ANTHONY. We do not know. There are now 8,000 civilians, but we have materially reduced the appropriation for civilian employees, and they will be cut about 40 per cent.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. That will make about 17,000. How many men will actually fly?

Mr. ANTHONY. The law provides that 90 per cent of the commissioned strength must fly.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. About how many men will that be?

Mr. ANTHONY. There are about 1,000 officers now.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. That is about 17 helpers to 1 flyer?

Mr. ANTHONY. Not quite in that proportion, but I would say to the gentleman that we did find that the Air Service was encumbered with a tremendous number of civilian employees, and in framing our appropriations we did so with the idea that we were going to try to compel the Air Service to fly itself instead of depending upon civilians to get them in the air.

Mr. SNYDER. I would like to know what occupation these civilians follow in the Air Service?

Mr. ANTHONY. In the Air Service they are nearly all mechanics. There are a good many laborers, but 2,000 of those civilians are employed at the engineering development plant at Dayton, Ohio, where experiments in aircraft are carried on.

Mr. DOWELL. How many civilian employees have been disposed of in this bill?

Mr. ANTHONY. I would say that if Congress enacts this bill into law the War Department will be compelled to perform a surgical operation on itself and get rid of about 40 per cent of its civilian employees.

Mr. DOWELL. Does that mean that the appropriation is such that it will be impossible for the department to employ these civilians?

Mr. ANTHONY. It will have to cut down its force to come within the money appropriated.

Mr. DOWELL. Or will they employ them and then come in with a deficiency?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will be frank with the gentleman. The committee has not appropriated enough money in this bill for the carrying on of an organization of the present size that the War Department now is, but if these appropriations are enacted into law the War Department will have to cut down the size of every one of the separate bureaus and organizations that compose its activities to bring it within the limitations imposed in this bill. If the gentleman will read the bill, he will find that we have made some changes in the language of the bill, because we have hedged in nearly every paragraph where there used to be lump-sum appropriations with limitations providing that not to exceed certain sums shall be expended for this or that activity. If you enact this bill into law, protected with the language that is carried in the bill, the War Department can not exceed that sum of money, and they must cut down their force to comply with it.

Mr. DOWELL. Then it will be impossible for them to employ these men?

Mr. ANTHONY. It will be, to continue to carry all its present force.

Mr. DOWELL. And then come in with a deficiency?

Mr. ANTHONY. The War Department can only come in for a deficiency for pay of the Army and for subsistence. We must feed and clothe and pay the Army. If they should enlist 280,000 men, Congress would have to provide for that, but in these other activities all through the bill they are limited to the exact sums appropriated.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to my colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. FIELDS. I believe the Secretary of War has already directed that the civilian personnel be reduced by at least 40 per cent, has he not?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes. I might tell the gentleman a very interesting story there, but I want my colleague, Mr. Cramton, to do that.

Mr. FIELDS. I saw a notice of it in the newspaper.

Mr. ANTHONY. It is very evident that the War Department has profited by the hearings held by this subcommittee, because nearly all of the points brought out along the lines of economy in the War Department have in the last day or two been put into effect under orders by the Secretary of War.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is providing \$5,000,000 for gas in the bill, \$3,000,000 of which—

Mr. ANTHONY. Three million dollars.

Mr. BLANTON. Three million dollars for the Air Service. I want to ask the gentleman—

Mr. ANTHONY. There is not \$5,000,000 for gasoline in the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Approximately that.

Mr. ANTHONY. No.

Mr. BLANTON. There is \$3,000,000 for the Air Service.

Mr. ANTHONY. Possibly \$3,500,000 altogether.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, in Texas last week gasoline was selling at 28 cents, and gasoline made a drop of 3 cents in one day, coming down to 25 cents for gasoline. We are paying 30 cents in Washington at this time without any drop. Has the gentleman made any provision with regard to buying its Government gasoline at places where they are able to sell it at 5 cents a gallon cheaper than they do in the Nation's Capital?

Mr. ANTHONY. It is estimated that gasoline will be considerably cheaper in the next fiscal year.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The appropriation in the current bill for the present fiscal year for vocational education in the Army is about \$3,500,000. I notice that the item in this bill carries \$1,000,000, only a little more than one-fourth of the amount carried in the existing law, and also there are some rather stringent provisions in here as to the use of that money. Is it the policy of the committee in so greatly reducing that to undertake to destroy, in effect, the system of vocational training in the Army?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say to the gentleman we did not intend to destroy real vocational training, but we do intend to cut out, if we possibly can, this idea of a large Army university. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, before I shall address myself to the matters in which I am interested in this Army bill I want to take this opportunity to express to the House the appreciation of the subcommittee and the appreciation of the full Committee on Appropriations for the magnificent services rendered to the committee, to this House, and to the country by the distinguished chairman who has just spoken to you. [Applause.] This gentleman has given a great deal of very patient attention and hard work to the preparation of this bill. Prior to my going on the committee with him my acquaintance had been a pleasant one, but I have learned to have the very highest regard for his ability, his honesty, and his integrity, and that is the most essential element of a good Congressman in this House. I do not believe that anyone would imagine that this comes from me, a partisan Democrat, in speaking of a partisan Republican, unless I meant every word that I say. He is a man full of the highest aims and purposes and has rendered the country great service in his work and influence on this bill.

Now, something was said a moment ago in reference to the plan adopted by this committee in cutting down the Army bill to 150,000, when the number fixed by legislation of this House a few days ago was 175,000 men. As a matter of fact that legislation was not fixed and did not fix and ought not to fix the size of the Army. I think a majority of the membership of this House were opposed to that measure. Every fair legislator knows that a matter of that much importance ought not to have been brought up under a suspension of the rules, because under the rule you could not vote for a less Army, you could not amend it, and if you voted against the resolution you put yourself in the attitude of voting for the present Army of 282,000 men. Therefore, those of us who believe in a less Army than 175,000 were taken by the throat and compelled to vote for the resolution or be placed in the attitude of voting for a larger Army than 175,000. I do not think that the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. KAHN] ought to have brought a matter of that much importance up under suspension of rules, where the debate is limited to 20 minutes on the side, and let the country believe that this House has fixed the Army at 175,000 men when he knows that there is a majority of the Members on this side of the House who would have been glad to have voted for 150,000 or even less. That was the most unfair and most unprecedented method of legislating since I have been a Member of the House. That was for the purpose of throttling the will of the House, and no one knew it better than the gentleman from California. I think it comes with poor grace for any man to now say that that legislation committed the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate money for 175,000 men.

I want to ask some gentleman who does not believe that we have appropriated for a sufficient army what enemy are we



afraid of to-day? Germany lies bankrupt; France is practically bankrupt; England is weighted down with debt; Europe is in no condition to fight a war. In other words, as was stated to you by the chairman of the committee a moment ago, the United States Government is in better condition to fight a war now than it ever was in the history of the country. She has over 4,000,000 well-trained young men who have just come out of the Army. She has material which is estimated by one man to be worth four or five billion dollars besides that which they are actually using. I do not know whether that statement is true or not, but we do know that there is a vast store of material which they have declined to declare a surplus. At any rate, with all of this material, with all of the guns, with all of the small arms, all of the rifles, all of the ammunition, with the magnificently trained officers we have, we are in better shape to fight a war to-day than any nation on the face of the earth. We may thank God that this war only lasted after we got into it for a little over a year, because another year would have made a terrible toll upon the young men of the country and a terrible drain upon the Treasury, because we all know that the war ended just 12 months earlier than we expected. In fact, the peak of resistance was expected to come just about a year from the date the armistice was signed. So I am at a loss to understand how a man could want a larger army than 150,000 men. The truth of the business is that so far as I am individually concerned, unless you can get something for these soldiers to do, I feel that 150,000 are too many. Our own people are now staggering under a load of taxation. When this war broke out the Army was only costing \$100,000,000 a year. The war is over more than a year, and this bill reported by this committee carries the stupendous sum of \$328,000,000, or an increase of over 328 per cent more than when the war with Germany began. Does not this satisfy, gentlemen? What consideration have gentlemen for the overburdened people that they represent? If I could have my way, there would be a more radical reduction of expenses all along the line. The Army produces nothing and the evil is not limited to the number of soldiers taken from the producing class. This is enough, but there is more than this.

That great evil is the enormous number of civilian employees that they have around these camps and cantonments. We were first given to understand it was 100,000 of those people, but a revision in the estimates shows something like 98,000 and odd. But, at any rate, if their last estimate is the true estimate, you will have more men waiting on the Army and the Navy than there will be of fighting men in the 150,000—that is, actual fighting men. If you take those men around the various offices, camps, and training fields that do the work, you will wonder why thousands of useful things might not be done by the soldiers and save millions on top of millions of dollars. These officers and soldiers have too many civilians waiting on them. I believe the Army can be made useful to themselves and made independent, red-blooded men by permitting them to do things for themselves. I do not believe men are improved as soldiers or as men by lying around the camps without having something to do besides drilling and acting soldiers.

They endeavor to make the Army life attractive by moving pictures and all sorts of recreation. I do not know how it is with other people, but I tell you that about the best recreation a man can have is to perform some good, honest toil. It will bring more contentment and satisfaction than drilling a few hours a day and having the recreation furnished at such an expense. I am going to make every Army man angry when he sees this statement, but I would like to hold up to them as a model the United States Marine Corps. The Marine Corps down here at Quantico are not waiting for Congress to appropriate money to improve their homes. They are taking that old camp, those old tumble-down buildings, unsightly affairs, and are taking off their uniforms and are pulling the buildings up on the hills, onto good lots, and are painting them and putting new foundations under them and making attractive homes of them. In the corps there are brick masons, carpenters, paper hangers, and so forth. Those boys are beautifying Quantico. If the Marine Corps stays there a little while they will have beautiful homes. They do this for a very small sum of money. Not over eight or nine hundred dollars. If you were to see those buildings when they get through with them you would think that they cost \$8,000 to \$10,000. But the Marine Corps is willing to go and "take hold of the smutty end of the chunk" themselves. And you ask why the Marine Corps is a favorite among so many Congressmen and so many people of the United States. The answer is that it is because of the spirit displayed by it.

Down at Panama, when the Appropriation Committee was making its annual visits for the purpose of ascertaining the

amount of money to be appropriated for the canal, Gen. Goethals, who is himself of the Army, told us that he had been guilty of misappropriating some funds. He declined to make any explanation until he showed a beautiful place, with fountains playing, with walks laid out, and the barracks all fixed up, and everything clean. Here was the explanation. He said that a committee of marines had come to him and asked him for a little lumber, paint, and cement in order to fix up the barracks, and he gave it to them. He said that he had no authority to do it, but did it. It cost only a few dollars. The result was one of the most beautiful places you ever saw.

Then he took us down to another place, where there were squalid old buildings. The walks were overgrown with vegetation. It was a horrible looking affair. "Now," he said, "I offered to do the same thing for the Army, but when they found out how it was to be done, their expression was, 'To hell with that, if the Government can not fix it up.'" The committee without a dissenting vote indorsed what he had done.

Going back to the Army, I do not believe we are justified in keeping so many civilian employees in performing service that these soldiers could perform, and would be better soldiers by performing. [Applause.] Your subcommittee agrees with that. Mr. Chairman, this Army reorganization bill is the most marvelous piece of legislation ever put together. There was never anything on earth like it. It is so constructed that when you appropriate money it all becomes one appropriation, and is so considered by the Army. It is difficult to put limitations upon it so as to control the items of appropriation, although we have made an effort to do it by limitations on this bill. You may appropriate money for one purpose, and they will take and use it for another.

You might just as well not try to limit the amount of money you are going to appropriate for the Army under this bill, because they will take the money and transfer it from the pay of the Army and for food and clothing of the Army, in which items they are permitted to create a deficiency by law, and use that money for those purposes for which they desire to use it, and then come back to Congress and ask you to give them millions of dollars of deficiencies in the pay of the Army and for food and clothing for the Army. Now, the only thing you have done heretofore, when you make this appropriation, as you have done, is just to write the figures at so many dollars for the Army, for they can convert it into a lump sum. That ought not to be. Congress ought to have control not only of the amount, but we ought to have absolute control of the items for which this money should be expended.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The gentleman suggests that Congress should do it. How would you do it?

Mr. SISSON. It is easy. You have got to rewrite your Army bill or allow your Committee on Appropriations to do some legislating. Of course, you are not going to do the latter.

Mr. BLANTON. The committee could have arranged it themselves by placing proper limitations on the appropriation of this money.

Mr. SISSON. Of course, we do not have such distinguished parliamentarians as my friend from Texas on our committee. If we had men like my friend from Texas, we could do all these things, but unfortunately we have no one on the committee, except such men as "Jim" Good, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and Mr. ANTHONY, the chairman of this subcommittee, and a few men of that caliber, and no one can tell how this thing can be done without legislating in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman has had wide experience in drafting different appropriation bills for the different departments of the Government. Do we understand that it is only the Army that causes deficiencies or the transfer of items for different purposes?

Mr. SISSON. I do not know. I have not helped to make up the naval bill.

Mr. FISHER. Is it true of all the departments of the Government and not one peculiar to the Army?

Mr. SISSON. It is peculiar certainly to the Army. The Army bill is fearfully and wonderfully made. During the war it was absolutely necessary to have large lump sums, virtually given to the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Army, and you are going to do that always when you have war; but in time of peace this bill ought to be sufficiently itemized so that a Congressman when voting can know exactly what he is voting for; else you can not control the appropriations.

Mr. HUSTED. If you cut down the Army from 175,000 to 150,000 men is not there some danger, and is not the opinion of the men who fought our battles for us that you would skele-

tonize the Army down to a point where it would cease to be an effective fighting unit as a whole? In other words, if you had a balanced Army, you would not have enough men in the various services which would be necessary to the Army as a whole?

Mr. SISSON. I must decline to yield further, because I have not the time at my disposal. Further, if my distinguished friend will follow off after experts, he will soon be out in a wilderness and will wander and wander. There is one thing that I am always afraid of, and that is the expert on Army matters, because the expert comes to you and tells you about a skeleton Army, which, of course, means nothing. You may have a big skeleton or you may have a little skeleton. Who is going to determine the size of the skeleton? Is it the man at the head of the Army or the General Staff or the people's Representatives who constitute the legislative department, whose duty it is to assume that responsibility? I am not willing that an Army officer shall determine for me the size of the Army that I think we ought to have. I will listen to him, and I will always say to my friend the Army officer, "I am glad you love a big Army, because you love the service you are in, and if you do not believe in a big Army, you ought not to be in it." But I insist that this Government ought not to be made simply an institution for the support of soldiers. I want it to have something else left for the support of other lines of endeavor. In the past the revenues of this Government have been largely absorbed by the Army and Navy.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. FISHER. I want to ask another question in regard to the diverting of the funds. The gentleman stated that the Army did not hesitate to divert funds from the purpose for which the Committee on Appropriations had written them in the bill to some other purpose. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not the Comptroller of the Treasury has not something to say about that?

Mr. SISSON. He has a great deal to say about that.

But the Comptroller of the Treasury has got to be controlled by what we write in the bill. You write it in the law and they will show the comptroller that Congress says "we may spend this money." That is what I am criticizing. I did say the Army officer did not hesitate to divert funds in violation of law. I am not criticizing the Army at all. Congress made that law, and that law permits it. The trouble is not with the Army officer but is with Congress, who permits it to be done with so much ease. [Laughter.] I want him to understand, however, that he is not putting it over me. I want him to understand that I at least know what is going on, and I protest against it. It may be that other men may want the Army officer to spend the money as he sees fit and proper, but I want to have something to say as to how I spend my own money, and I think as public officials we should be more particular in spending public funds which are put into our hands than in spending our own money.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I would like to know what functions are performed by the General Staff that could not be just as well performed by others in the Army?

Mr. SISSON. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. I am a somewhat prejudiced witness. My observation while on the Committee on Appropriations during the war was that the General Staff served the very magnificent purpose of being the principal "buck passer" of all the Army. [Laughter.] Now, if you try to find out what is done anywhere in the Army you trace it around from the Secretary of War to the General Staff, and when you trace it into the General Staff, there you have lost it. [Laughter.] I have never been able to get any concrete information out of the General Staff at all.

When you ask them about something they will say, "That is under Gen. So-and-so's department." You go to Gen. So-and-so's department, and he will tell you, "I am acting under the General Staff." I do not see that General Staff. It is the hardest thing on earth to locate. If anyone can find that General Staff, I will give him a nice little chromo. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. SISSON. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. I had occasion to call up an officer the other day for certain information, and he said that matter was under Col. So-and-so. I hunted up that Col. So-and-so, and he said it was under the jurisdiction of another colonel. I hunted up that other colonel, and he said it was under the jurisdiction of still

another colonel, and altogether I called up six colonels, and the last colonel said it was under Col. So-and-so, and—

Mr. SISSON. And then you got discouraged and got on a street car and gave up the chase? [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. No. Finally the last colonel told me that that matter was under the control of the first colonel whom I had seen, and I called him up again, and he said, "I made a mistake when I first told you it was under Col. So-and-so. I find it is under me." [Laughter.]

Mr. SISSON. Yes. I believe that the Army officers are as honorable men as you and I ever knew. I believe that so far as peculation or dishonesty is concerned, it is the farthest thing from their souls. The training they go through at West Point and their training as Army officers cause them to despise peculation in the Army. But I never saw a bunch of men who were more careless and reckless about the expenditure of money which they think is for a proper purpose than are the Army officers.

Mr. MADDEN. That is because they do not know what money is.

Mr. SISSON. It may be that that is because they are educated at the expense of the Government. As Gen. Goethals once told me in conversation, the civil engineer in private employment has to look after economical methods in order to get contracts, but the Army engineer does not have to look after funds but simply after results, and the consequence is that they never have been trained along economical lines.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The gentleman was kind enough to speak of the existing fact that under the forms of the Army appropriation bill Army items can be juggled from one purpose to another, so that the purpose of Congress is often defeated. I wish to say that it was the expectation of the Committee on Military Affairs when it was still an appropriating committee to follow the Army reorganization act with a new draft of the Army appropriation bill, which would accomplish the very things that the gentleman regrets can not be accomplished by a bill reported from the general Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SISSON. You would have to change your Army reorganization bill to do it. But I can not enter into that discussion now.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I only wanted to make it clear that—

Mr. SISSON. I will remind the gentleman that my time is limited.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. At that time we had appropriating power, and now we have legislative power, which the gentleman's committee does not have. Now, you have taken away our appropriating power and lost your power to legislate.

Mr. SISSON. This Congress did it. Men are talking about that matter and criticizing people. Both the Republican and Democratic platforms demanded something like this. But, more than that, a man ought not to get angry solely because it may affect, as he thinks, his standing in the House. Members here ought to be willing to serve the country generally. A man now, if he thinks he loses a little prestige or influence on the floor of the House, becomes angry because the House saw fit to place all appropriations in one committee. But all this evil grew up under the old system. We have done all that you could have done on an appropriation bill. Your committee can legislate now as it could when you made the appropriations. You could not legislate on this bill when you had it. This change was made by the House for the good of the country and not to give a man or a committee prominence in this House.

I do not care personally what you do with it. It is immaterial to me whether you leave the appropriating power here or whether you take it back to your own committee. But while I am on that subject I want to tell you about an unholy alliance that caused it all to be taken away. When the Committee on Appropriations was created in 1866 it had all the appropriations, but when Mr. John G. Carlisle, of Kentucky, was elected Speaker, Sam Randall, of Pennsylvania, was chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and there was a faction in the Democratic Party. Mr. Carlisle and Mr. William R. Morrison, of Illinois, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and Mr. Thomas B. Reed, then a distinguished Member of the House from Maine, and the Republicans joined hands with that faction, and voted with Mr. Carlisle and Mr. Morrison and their crowd to curb Sam Randall's power, and to take the power away from the Committee on Appropriations and divide it up among the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Naval Affairs, the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and so on.



But there was one man on the floor at that time, a distinguished Member of Congress, and if you want to read a great debate turn to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and see what was said there. He was the one Republican who had the courage to stand up and make the fight on the floor of the House, and he prophesied what would happen. He said, "This is no time to play politics, and you ought not to play politics with this matter." He told the House then what would be the result. He told them they were going to enter upon an era of extravagance the like of which this country never had seen. That gentleman is still a Member of the House, and he has remained here long enough to see his prophecy literally fulfilled.

He was the one man who was not swept off his feet by partisan politics, but kept his mind constantly open; and knowing human nature, and knowing how men will make a pet of their particular line of legislation that they have charge of, he opposed the change which was made at that time. Go back and read his speech. No man can improve on it to-day. Read his statement as to why there should be one appropriating committee. That speech was made by Uncle JOE CANNON, of Illinois, who is still a Member of this House. [Applause.]

Mr. CHINDBLOM. When was that?

Mr. SISSON. It was shortly after Mr. Carlisle was elected Speaker, and Mr. Randall was chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. You can look it up.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am sure my friend from Mississippi does not want to be misunderstood.

Mr. SISSON. No; I do not.

Mr. McKENZIE. I listened to the gentleman's strictures on the General Staff. I want to ask the gentleman, if he had it in his power to write the military legislation of our country, whether he would omit therefrom the provision creating the General Staff?

Mr. SISSON. I would, and I would put the responsibility on the Secretary of War and let him choose his own advisers. That is what I would do, and then I would have him in the shape that the Secretary of the Navy is in. They tried to put the General Staff over on the Secretary of the Navy and he was able to defeat it here in this House.

No; when you begin to divide authority it is too much like the German general staff. I do not like militarism. By the way, before I forget it I am going to discuss something else now, but I want to say that I do not want to reflect upon the personnel of the General Staff. They are very estimable gentlemen. I do not know whether I know many of them or not, because I do not know who are on the General Staff. I do know the Chief of Staff, and one or two more, but I do not know the others when I meet them, and I do not know that anybody else knows them when he meets them. I do not know whether there are 25 of them or 2,500 of them, and nobody else seems to know.

Mr. McKENZIE. The gentleman is willing to admit the fact that the German general staff was a very great military staff?

Mr. SISSON. I am, indeed, willing to admit that, and that Germany was a great military power, but I am still unwilling to convert this Republic into a Germanized, militarized Government, where the soldiery shall control the Government instead of the people controlling it. [Applause.]

Now, I wish to say that in my judgment in this educational movement I see a great deal of danger for Congressmen in the future. The War Department were advertising in the newspapers, but they say they have quit that. They were advertising in papers. They still have the propaganda, and have people out spreading the propaganda, "If you want to get an education, join the Army," that in the Army you may be educated, and that it is the principal thing. Very little is said about military training. I am getting letters, and no doubt you are; and when John Jones, from your neighborhood, enlists in the Army he goes to school, and he writes back to Bill. Bill's mother and father discuss it. They are not able to educate Bill, and they say, "We would like very much to have Bill go to that school."

What is the result? The people back home begin to demand bigger appropriations to enlarge these military schools, and the result is that you enlarge the schools and enlarge the demand for them, the demand for schools supported by State appropriations will cease and State legislatures will be delighted to relieve themselves of that burden, and the result will be that you will gradually have this thing grow so that it will be just as it was in Prussia. That was not a day's growth, and Prussianism was never able to grow until it made the German people realize that the boy was being educated at the expense of the Government. When that was done, first he was trained for seven years, then he got five years, and later they reduced it to three years; and what I fear is, that the people without knowing it are going to begin to demand more money for these

schools. I do not object to the rehabilitation of the boys who were injured in the war. I do not object to spending all the money that is necessary to try to help these boys along the highway of life after they have been wounded and maimed in the war, but I am unwilling that this Government, under the guise of military training, should build up an educational system that will appeal to the people throughout the United States, so that the voters will compel Members of Congress to vote for these great national schools or else they will defeat you. I think there is great danger that in a few years that Prussianism that we fought to destroy will be the system here.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 30 minutes.

Mr. SISSON. I will take 10 minutes more.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield for a question in that connection?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman well knows that for the last year or two the Army has been holding out the inducement under authority of law for young men to enter the Army upon the specific promise that while in the service they will be given the opportunity to secure vocational training.

Does the gentleman think it is right under these circumstances, after they have persuaded the young men to enlist under these promises, for the committee to practically destroy the whole vocational system?

Mr. SISSON. Oh, no; we have not done that in this bill. That is the only reason I did not reserve the right to be against this appropriation, because I want to carry out the contract obligations we are under. But I do not want it to be the permanent policy of the Federal Government. Here is going to be the trouble, under the guise of educating the boy if they keep him three years, as the Pope said about children, "You give me the training of the child until he is 10 years of age and I do not care who has the child after that, I will make him a Catholic." Nothing was ever said truer than that. Nobody knows better than my distinguished friend that if you take a young man and put him in the Army for three years and let him associate with other soldiers, give him their sort of an education, you will find when he leaves he will have a tender heart for the Army, and he becomes a voter in the country for its enlargement and its interest as he was taught to.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. This bill provides \$1,000,000 for vocational training?

Mr. SISSON. It does.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Can the gentleman give us some information regarding some of the witnesses who appeared before your committee? I remember one from Finland and one from Mississippi that had been connected with vocational training.

Mr. SISSON. Oh, yes; I know him very well. He is a fine gentleman. Ah, but I tell you that when you get one of these fellows in this work he is never satisfied. He ought to be engaged in the work enthusiastically or he is not worth anything; but I am not willing to appropriate more money than we are appropriating in this bill for this purpose at this time.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. I desire to ask the gentleman from Mississippi if he does not believe—for instance, at Camp Lee—that the boys of our country could be given better instruction along agricultural lines than at an agricultural school?

Mr. SISSON. Oh, I never saw any evidence of that. I never saw a boy that wanted to go back to the plow. Our trouble is to induce the boys who were in the late war to go back to the plow. I tell you the Army life does not tend to fit a man so that he desires to go back to the plow. It is all very well to talk about the poetry of the smell of the upturned sod and of the dogwood blossoms, the singing of the birds, the tinkle of the babbling brook, the rattling of the chains, and the whistling of the boy on his mule in the early morn on his way to the field; it is all very nice, but you just try to take hold of plowhandles, get up at daylight, feed the horse or the mule, and by the time the sun gets up take hold of the plow and plow until 12 o'clock; go back and feed your horse, get something to eat, and then get back to work by 1 o'clock, and work until sundown, and it takes all the poetry out of that boy forever. [Applause.]

There is one thing you get that you like and that is by night you have a magnificent appetite and you have a magnificent desire to sleep. But where you get a fellow into the Army camp with the moving pictures and pretty girls coming around to see you, good music, Uncle Sam furnishing the clothes and the meals, you are going to give that fellow a good time, and he will not go back to the plow.

There is no trouble in getting a man to go around over the plantation riding around under an umbrella astride of a horse and seeing the other fellow do it.

But that is not bothering me. What is bothering me in the future is the millions of acres of untitled land, and the boys deserting the farms and agriculture. The man that can solve that problem to-day, the man that can devise some scheme to induce these boys to go back to the farm, so that the boys of the cities may wear high collars, ride in the street cars, see the magnificent business houses, so that the great factories may continue to run—that is all right, but let me tell you the man that can devise a scheme that will bring these boys back to the plow will be one of the greatest statesmen that this country has seen.

Buckle, in his History of Civilization, says that any nation whose agriculture begins to wane is in a dying condition, and he makes this marvelous statement, that no great nation in the past whose agriculture has commenced to wane has ever been able to rehabilitate it and induce the people to go back. Whether that is true I don't know, but if it is true we are in a lamentable condition in America. I believe if you can get some training in the Army to make a man love to plow he will be glad to try it. But if you want to hear a revolutionary cry you put private soldiers to a plow with some captain looking after ten or a dozen and teaching them how to plow. No; they do not want to join the Army to get an education and devote themselves to physical toil and physical work. That is the trouble with the educational system throughout the United States.

We are teaching our boys that the thing to do is to go to school so as to avoid work. They are not willing to do as old Cato did, who resigned his seat in the Senate after he had led the armies of Rome to glorious victory, in order that he might go back and take hold of the plowhandles again.

Mr. CALDWELL. Do I understand the gentleman's argument to tend to the proposition that we should keep the boys in ignorance in order that they might stay on the farm?

Mr. Sisson. I did not say anything of that sort.

Mr. CALDWELL. That is what I gathered from the gentleman's statement.

Mr. Sisson. Oh, the gentleman gathers a great many things that are not true.

Mr. CALDWELL. The gentleman gave me that impression.

Mr. Sisson. I did not give the gentleman anything of the kind. He did not get it from me, and nobody in this House thought that I even hinted at anything like that.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. NEELY. In behalf of historical accuracy, I want to ask my friend if he does not mean Cincinnatus instead of Cato?

Mr. Sisson. As a matter of fact, if the gentleman will read Plutarch's Life of Cato he will find that Cato also was a man given much to plowing; and not only that, but I do not know but that the Cincinnatus story of going to the plow is something of a myth. However, there is no doubt about old Cato.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. NEELY. I wish to say that Plutarch is my authority for the statement that it was Cincinnatus who also left his place to go to the plow.

Mr. Sisson. Well, Plutarch is mighty good authority. I may be wrong in my supposition.

Mr. CARAWAY. Will the gentleman not admit that both Cincinnatus and Cato were planters—they lived in town?

Mr. Sisson. The story goes that Cincinnatus was called from the plow, and if you will go down here and look at the picture that Brumidi made, you will see Cincinnatus at the plow on one side with Israel Putnam on the other, and Israel Putnam is known to-day more by the fact that he plowed than he is by the fact that he fought in the Revolution, but the fact that he was a plowman made the world understand that a man who plows can fight, and I wish the Army could get that.

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, Israel Putnam's fame rests upon the fact that he rode down some stone steps on horseback, and not that he plowed. I know it because I have seen the picture of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi has consumed 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Sisson. Then I shall talk for five minutes longer. I want to show to you gentlemen a very interesting document. Here is the most interesting document that I have seen in some time. Will you gentlemen imagine that in longhand this book which I hold in my hand contains the entire appropriations for the great Federal Government in 1802? I want to read just a few of the items for the sake of Members and especially of those who are complaining about salaries. The total amount

appropriated during that year was \$3,448,147.18. This is not enough now to keep one battleship afloat for one year. I want to read here a most delightful bill of fare for the soldiers on our ships, and I am sure that my friend CALDWELL will not object at all, and if you will keep this bill of fare posted you will not have to use posters costing millions to get men to enlist. The estimate submitted for one ship of war of 44 guns and 312 men for 12 months is as follows:

284 barrels of beef, at \$13.....	\$3,692.00
244 barrels of pork, at \$18.....	4,392.00
83 barrels of flour, at \$10.....	830.00
8,112 pounds of suet, at 8 cents.....	648.96
99,645 pounds of bread, at \$4.....	3,985.80
6,084 pounds of cheese, at 12½ cents.....	760.50
2,028 pounds of butter, at 20 cents.....	405.60
254 bushels of peas, at 87½ cents.....	222.25
16,224 pounds of rice, at \$3.33½.....	540.80
1,014 gallons of molasses at 75 cents.....	760.50
1,014 gallons of vinegar, at 30 cents.....	304.20
7,118 gallons of spirits, at \$1.12½.....	8,007.75
Total.....	24,550.36

The amount carried for the entire support of that ship was \$24,550.36. There are many others here, and you may find them omitting some of their bill of fare, but I have never yet run upon any of these ships that left the spirits out. They seem to have had some fighting spirit along with other kinds of spirit in those days. I want my Republican friends to recall that Thomas Jefferson was then President.

In 1802 the salary of a district Federal judge was \$1,000, and the largest salaries were paid in the States of North Carolina, Virginia, and New York, which were pretty big States in those days, and the salary there was \$1,800 a year. If I had not taken up so much time answering questions, I would have been able to put a good deal more of this historic document into the Record.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. In one moment. As I look over this document and these estimates, I find the activities of the Federal Government were squarely limited at that time to the constitutional powers of the Federal Government. Our activities have now grown so that it is extremely doubtful whether one-half of what we are doing, when tried by the rule of the Constitution, would be held to be constitutional.

In conclusion, let me state that if the appropriations continue in the Federal Government as they have, and the expenditures of our State, county, and municipal governments continue as they have, I believe the total Government expense will be something like \$15,000,000,000 a year in time of peace. I do not know what it costs to keep up the church establishments, but I will presume it costs \$2,500,000,000.

I do not know, nor can the Bureau of Statistics tell you, what the net earnings of the American people are after paying all of their necessary expenses during one current fiscal year. They can tell you how many bushels of corn are produced, and they can tell you how many bushels of corn have been sold, but they can not tell you accurately how much of what a man produces he consumes in his own livelihood. I do not know whether the American people produce net every year more than \$15,000,000,000, but Montesquieu tells you that when the time is reached that the nonproductive or salaried, governmental, or church establishments take more from the people than their net earnings amount to, that nation is doomed to destruction unless you shall reduce expenditures, because it will soon reduce your people to a condition of dire poverty. If \$15,000,000,000 is what will be expended, if you will add the fixed indebtedness of this Government in the shape of interest on our bonds, all of it will amount to something like that.

Therefore, gentlemen of the committee, it is well enough for us to practice some real, genuine, and rigid economy until we can take an inventory of what we have.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed five additional minutes.

Mr. Sisson. One minute more. Think of the enormous amount of the farms and homes, unimproved real estate, undeveloped mines that are assessed as a part of the wealth of America which produce nothing. If you take the net earnings of the American people I doubt extremely whether it amounts to more than \$15,000,000,000. Now, if it is true any man is not only not a patriot, but he is not a friend of the Army, he is not a friend of the future Army if he will raise this bill one dollar, because the American people are bearing enough burdens at this time to support this enormous Army Establishment even under the appropriations which this committee has granted. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 46 minutes.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.



Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Mississippi yield some of his time?

Mr. Sisson. Yes; I will yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has only 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. Sisson. I have two hours.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has no knowledge of any order by which the gentleman has more than one hour.

Mr. Sisson. Well, I understood we agreed on four hours—two hours to a side.

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; the motion was agreed to.

Mr. Sisson. We agreed to four hours.

Mr. ANTHONY. And the gentleman was to have half of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not recollect that order.

Mr. Sisson. I know the gentleman from Kansas made the motion for four hours.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is clear as to the amount of time fixed at four hours, but the control—

Mr. ANTHONY. The gentleman from Mississippi was to have half the time.

Mr. Sisson. That was in the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman from Mississippi controlling half the time?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That was agreed to in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. Sisson. Now, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]. [Applause.]

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to use this time in discussing a feature of this bill which I think of the utmost importance, namely, the conservation and extraction of helium. At the top of page 14 of the bill appears this language, "Experimentation, conservation, and production of helium, \$100,000." Strictly speaking, perhaps, the term "production" is a misnomer. It is contemplated that the helium will be extracted from natural gas rather than produced. But the term "\$100,000," in my judgment, is even more out of keeping with the purpose of the appropriation. It is entirely inadequate.

A few years ago we heard much of the advocacy of preparedness. The necessity for it seemed generally recognized throughout our land. In the two years which are just drawing to a close in our legislative history, we have heard on this floor much debate upon the subject of whether or not we were sufficiently prepared for the great World War. Under these circumstances I feel justified in assuming that I am altogether entitled to uniform bipartisan approval in the sermon of preparedness which I come now to preach, and naturally I expect supporting demonstrations from each amen corner by those who have professed this faith.

I trust that our country may always enjoy the blessings of peace, but history has proven for us conclusively that some nations begin wars and others have wars thrust upon them. What the future may hold in store in this regard is entirely beyond our ken. But it seems that the necessity for a proper preparedness for any contingency which is likely to arise has ever been recognized in the United States. It is this constant policy which makes the conservation of helium a matter of prime importance.

Concerning helium there is much popular misunderstanding. I do not pose as an authority on the subject and have little or no technical knowledge of it, but there are certain practical considerations which a study of it will impress upon the layman at once as of sufficient importance to make its proper conservation imperative. It is from this intensely practical viewpoint that I wish to speak to you. This country has made helium available as a national asset. This Nation has practically a monopoly of the supply. The question is, now that we have determined somewhat the extent of this valuable possession and have established at considerable expense plants for its extraction, shall we surrender these advantages by a policy of legislative indifference?

It is my purpose to endeavor to anticipate your questions and answer them as briefly as I may. The first natural inquiry concerns the discovery of helium and what helium is. It seems that it was discovered by the French astronomer Janssen in 1868 in the surrounding envelope of the sun, and hence was called helium, derived from the Greek word helios, meaning the sun. It was found on the earth by Sir William Ramsay, an English chemist, in 1894 in a gas evolved from certain minerals. Dr. H. P. Cady, of the University of Kansas, in 1907, discovered that a certain natural gas in Kansas contained more than 1 per cent of helium. Further research has been

principally governmental, and I shall acquaint you later with the outlines of its development. Helium is the only known non-inflammable, noncombustible gas which can be used satisfactorily in the operation of balloons. Chemically it is very inert. It can not be ignited and can not be exploded. It is the lightest gas next to hydrogen, with which our balloons and dirigibles heretofore have been filled. Of course, hydrogen is highly inflammable, and the danger due to its use on this account is a source of constant dread. It thus affords a very vulnerable spot for attack. The slightest spark or the penetration of an incendiary bullet would collapse a hydrogen-filled balloon like the bursting of a soap bubble. The helium-filled bag, on the contrary, may be pierced time and again with red-hot bullets without peril either to the balloon or those operating it. Its use thus eliminates that severe strain and tension of the crew, which is naturally incidental to the use of hydrogen, and thereby promotes much greater efficiency. Furthermore, helium, though twice as heavy as hydrogen, has, by reason of its buoyancy, a little more than 92 per cent of its lifting power. The difference in this respect, therefore, is relatively insignificant. For instance, 1,000 cubic feet of pure hydrogen will lift a weight of 75.14 pounds; a similar quantity of pure helium will lift 69.58 pounds. It is now thought that there will probably be absolute safety for aeronautical purposes in a mixture of about 85 per cent of helium and 15 per cent of hydrogen. Such a mixture would have about 93½ per cent of the lifting power of hydrogen, which means that a thousand cubic feet of it would lift 70.18 pounds.

In aeronautics, therefore, the use of helium in times of war is of the utmost importance for the following reasons: First, its wastage through fabrics is but one-half that of hydrogen. And it may be said in passing that this leakage percentage may be greatly reduced by lining the cloth covering of a helium dirigible with what is known as goldbeater's skin, which is made from the intestines of cows. Experiments are being made also to perfect a self-healing fabric. Second, it affords safety for the crew from the ordinary attack against dirigibles. Third, despite this safety, there is no material reduction in the lifting power of a balloon filled with helium. Fourth, it affords mental and physical calmness and corresponding efficiency for the crew by reason of the practical invulnerability of a helium-filled dirigible.

The next pertinent questions concerning helium are, Where is it found and in what quantities? In a very small proportion it is in the air, the estimate being one part of helium to something between 100,000 to 250,000 parts of air. That fact is at present of no practical importance. It has been found also emanating from certain hot springs and from volcanoes, but its principal appearance for practical purposes is in the natural gas of several of the gas fields of the United States. There is a small quantity of helium in Canada, where probably eight or ten million cubic feet a year might be obtained, and a smaller quantity in Tuscany, Italy, but this country has twenty-five or thirty times as much as the remainder of the world. No very considerable quantity has been found in any other land.

It seems that Dr. Cady, to whom I have referred, and one of his associates were the first to find helium in natural gas. That discovery was made in Kansas in 1907. The gas in Kansas bore more than 1 per cent of helium, but the volume of the gas was not sufficient for any very extensive operation. The Bureau of Mines then began to make a diligent survey in an effort to locate available sources of supply. Upon the success of this undertaking has been predicated the whole program of the Government for the conservation and extraction and use of helium. Helium has been found in reasonable quantities in Texas in the Petrolia gas fields; in Oklahoma, all through the Osage and running northeast to the Kansas border; in the southeast part of Kansas, in the Dexter and Sedan fields in particular; in Vinton County, Ohio; in Ontario and Genesee Counties, N. Y.; in Potter and McKean Counties, Pa.; in Randolph County, W. Va.; in Shelby and Hancock Counties, Ind.; and in a few other places. And it is worthy of mention that in these various fields in this country a million cubic feet of helium daily is the estimated wastage into the air.

Now, the Government naturally felt it a duty, in view of the possible uses of helium and our practical monopoly of it, to conserve this supply. In this connection let me call to your attention the fact that a 3,000,000 cubic feet helium-filled dirigible can carry from 70 to 80 tons. Imagine what this would mean in times of war in an invulnerable ship with a cargo of T. N. T. These dirigibles, by the way, are further fortified against attack by being divided into compartments. The engine may be raised near the framework, inasmuch as there is no danger of ignition from the exhausts, as in the case

of hydrogen, and a direct drive is thus afforded. The adaptability of helium to the purposes of observation balloons is also readily apparent.

Feeling this responsibility, the War and Navy Departments and the Bureau of Mines began to think on the best method and most feasible place for beginning the work. I shall recite but very briefly the history of its development. In the gas field at Petrolia, Tex., helium was discovered in a quantity of almost 1 per cent of the natural gas, and because of the volume of gas in that field it was thought a most desirable one for extraction purposes. Two temporary plants for experimentation by two different processes were established at Fort Worth and a third for still another process at Petrolia. This was during the latter part of 1917 and the early part of 1918. These plants were first known as argon plants in order to preserve secrecy of their value as a war agency. Contracts were closed for a supply of the gas with the company in charge of the Petrolia field. The experimentation at Petrolia was by the so-called Norton process. The plants at Fort Worth employed the Linde Co. process and the Air Reduction Co. process, respectively, and were located in that city because of the necessity for more water and more power than was available at Petrolia. From the experimentation at these temporary plants there was extracted about 150,000 cubic feet of helium, and this gas, stored in steel cylinders, was on the dock at New Orleans awaiting shipment to France at the time of the signing of the armistice. Because of the success of this preliminary experimentation the War and Navy Departments, realizing the great importance of a proper supply of helium for military purposes, decided in August, 1918, to build a large extraction plant at Fort Worth to supersede the two temporary ones which had been constructed there. This plant has been completed and arrangements for a supply of the gas from the pipe line have been made, and active operation is to begin March 1, 1921. This plant at Fort Worth has a capacity of from 40,000 to 50,000 cubic feet per day, and I doubt if there is a more complete establishment of any kind in the Government service. The process of extraction of helium in use at this plant—the Linde process—has been established as an absolutely successful one, and helium of 95 per cent purity is obtained thereby. The other 5 per cent is nitrogen, also noninflammable; but I am informed that by reason of improvements in the process the likelihood is that 100 per cent pure helium is an early probability. The plant at Petrolia, with a capacity of from 18,000 to 20,000 cubic feet per day, is due to start extraction June 1, 1921.

Let me assure you that this program is in no sense a matter of sectional pride but, rather, a proposition of national defense. The helium now available from the Petrolia field will likely be exhausted in a few years and these plants moved and established elsewhere. The natural gas of Petrolia is being used constantly for fuel and light in a large city. The necessity is urgent that the helium be extracted from it while it may be had. If we delay our operation the prize of our quest may be gone. The supply must be developed or wasted or shipped out of the country, and the hearings show that an effort has been made by a company to get control of our helium that it may be sent abroad. Let us be alive to this situation and let us not wait to lock our barn after our horse has departed.

The next question is an important and intensely practical one, and that is, What is the cost of extracting helium? Until April, 1918, it is probable that not more than 100 cubic feet of helium had been separated, and that was due largely to scientific curiosity in various laboratories. That separation was at the absolutely prohibitive price of from \$1,700 to \$2,000 a cubic foot. The temporary governmental plants reduced the cost to 40 cents per cubic foot. The Bureau of Mines by its investigations began to blaze a trail toward still cheaper extraction. The report accompanying the Army appropriation bill last year recommended an inquiry into the practicability of securing helium at a reasonable price and in large quantities. Accordingly that investigation has continued, and it is now estimated that the cost of extraction at the Fort Worth plant will be \$56 per thousand cubic feet, 5.6 cents per cubic foot, or about one-seventh of the cost of separation at the earlier experimental plants. This is a little more than five times the cost of hydrogen during the war. If the process being used at Petrolia, which is yet an experimental one, should prove a success, helium may be extracted thereby at twice the cost paid for hydrogen during the war. And in this connection we should not fail to contemplate the cost in lives and the cost in dirigibles from explosions due to the use of hydrogen. Probably you still remember the serious mishaps at Baltimore and Chicago. Everything considered, the elimination of loss of life and property by the use of helium will likely make its use less expensive than that of hydrogen even if the present cost of extraction should not be reduced.

Another natural question is how much would it cost to fill with helium a large dirigible, like the R-34, for instance, which came over from England? The capacity of the R-34 is between two and three million cubic feet; I think, about two and one-half million. To fill it with helium would cost about \$125,000; but the helium may be kept indefinitely and purified when necessary at a nominal cost. This is not true of hydrogen. Compare the utility in war of such a machine filled with helium with the utility of a battleship, and you will see very readily that, for the results that may be obtained, this is comparatively a small expenditure as war costs go. The price of a dirigible, according to my best information, is about \$1 per cubic foot of capacity; the price of the helium to fill it is now a little more than 5 cents per cubic foot. A sufficient number of metal tanks is already on hand at the Fort Worth plant for the storing of eighteen or twenty million cubic feet.

The cost of the development of helium extraction has been borne equally by the Army and Navy. The engineers estimate the annual cost of operation at Fort Worth at \$885,000, and at Petrolia at from \$270,000 to \$300,000. In the estimates an additional sum was asked for leasing certain fields in the United States where helium occurs in order that the supply might be properly conserved. To operate the plants we have established will cost a total of about \$1,200,000, and, as I have intimated, necessary appropriations have heretofore been made on the basis of one-half in the Army appropriation bill and one-half in the Navy appropriation bill. The question is, Shall we now dismantle the plants we have constructed at such expense just when we have finished preparing them for the preservation of this greatest military asset? We have expended about \$7,000,000 in this project—a large sum, but only a fractional part of the cost of a battleship. We experimented long enough to see the feasibility of it, and then we authorized the expenditure of a sufficient sum for the necessary plants and equipment. They are just ready to begin full-capacity operation. Under these circumstances what shall our policy be?

A reduction of the necessary appropriation to run the plants we have established and which are just now completed for operation will mean the shutting down of these plants for a corresponding length of time. Neither the time nor the helium thus wasted can be recovered. The output of wells now in operation is, of course, daily decreasing, and we are gradually being deprived of the greatest known element of air supremacy. It is a national and not a local situation which confronts us. To discourage further development would be a disastrous policy. In the proper preservation of this great asset may rest the surest hope of economy in reducing the great expense necessary to the maintenance of the armed forces of our country. Let us not squander a wealth which seems peculiar to this Nation, but let us properly foster this God-given source of preparedness, which seems to offer a cheaper and more satisfactory solution of many problems of our national defense. [Applause.]

Now I want to call attention briefly, gentlemen, to a few of the items of expense that have already been incurred in order to make it possible to extract helium in the quantities desired. As I have said, we have first satisfied ourselves by experimentation of the possibility and feasibility of the separation of helium from natural gas. Then came the matter of the construction of plants—

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. Does the gentleman favor the movement that has been on foot to prevent private persons or private organizations from manufacturing helium gas in this country?

Mr. LANHAM. I will say to the gentleman that in a sense it is a misnomer to speak of manufacturing helium gas. It is not possible to manufacture helium gas except at really a prohibitive expense. It is the extraction of helium gas—

Mr. McKEOWN. I mean its extraction from natural gas.

Mr. LANHAM. The helium board, consisting of an officer from the Army, one from the Navy, and one from the Bureau of Mines, as well as the gentlemen in charge of the Air Service, are very much opposed to any private commercialization of the helium extraction that may contemplate export.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. One minute.

Mr. Sisson. I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. LANHAM. I wish to cite these items of cost which we have already expended:

Cost of Fort Worth plant.....	\$2,123,194
Cost of pipe line from Petrolia to Fort Worth (length of pipe line, 104 miles).....	1,617,952
Cost of contract for conservation of helium.....	1,250,000
Cost of Petrolia plant, about.....	400,000



These plants are just ready to operate, and the question is, gentlemen, now that these outlays have been made and this extraction shown to be feasible, shall we not at least for a period of one year see if this most important proposition is a proper and paying one? [Applause.]

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to have a quorum here.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-five gentlemen are present, not a quorum.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise, and on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and Mr. ANTHONY and Mr. McCLINTIC took their places as tellers.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 2, noes 64.

The CHAIRMAN. A quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Ayres	Ferris	Lufkin	Riordan
Bakka	Focht	Lubring	Robinson, N. C.
Baer	Fordney	McCulloch	Rowan
Bell	Freeman	McGlennon	Rowe
Benson	Gallagher	McKinley	Rucker
Blackmon	Gallivan	McKinley	Sabath
Bland, Mo.	Gandy	McLane	Sanders, Ind.
Britten	Ganly	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sanford
Browne	Glynn	McLeod	Schall
Brumbaugh	Godwin, N. C.	Madden	Scott
Burke	Goldfogle	Maher	Scully
Burrhoughs	Goodall	Mann, Ill.	Sells
Campbell, Pa.	Goodwin, Ark.	Mann, S. C.	Sherwood
Candler	Gould	Mansfield	Sims
Cantrell	Graham, Pa.	Mason	Small
Caraway	Hamill	Mead	Smith, Mich.
Carew	Hamilton	Milligan	Smithwick
Casey	Harrell	Montague	Stedman
Clark, Fla.	Harrison	Moon	Steele
Clark, Mo.	Hawley	Mooney	Stiness
Classon	Hays	Moore, Va.	Strong, Pa.
Connally	Hersman	Moore, Ind.	Sullivan
Cooper	Hill	Morin	Summers, Wash.
Copley	Hullings	Mudd	Tague
Costello	Hull, Tenn.	Murphy	Taylor, Colo.
Crowther	Humphreys	Nelson, Mo.	Tincher
Currie, Mich.	Husted	Nelson, Wis.	Tinkham
Davey	Ireland	Newton, Minn.	Towner
Davis, Minn.	James, Mich.	Nicholls	Treadway
Denison	Johnson, Miss.	Nolan	Upshaw
Dent	Johnson, S. Dak.	Olney	Vare
Dewalt	Johnson, Wash.	Pell	Vinson
Donovan	Johnston, N. Y.	Perlman	Voigt
Dooling	Kennedy, Iowa	Peters	Walters
Doremus	Kennedy, R. I.	Phelan	Ward
Dunn	Kincheloe	Porter	Watson
Eagan	Kitchin	Pou	Whaley
Eagle	Kleckka	Rainey, Ala.	White, Me.
Edmonds	Kreider	Rainey, Henry T.	Wilson, Pa.
Elston	Lazaro	Reavis	Wise
Emerson	Loneragan	Reed, W. Va.	Wood, Ind.
Field	Longworth	Riddick	Wright

Thereupon the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill H. R. 15943, the Army appropriation bill, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, whereupon 250 Members answered to their names, and he submitted a list of the absentees for printing in the Record and the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The committee will resume its sitting.

The committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] is recognized.

Mr. ANTHONY. Is the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] prepared to use any more of his time?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. I would like to use 1 minute, and then the gentleman can use 10 minutes. I yield one minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for one minute.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman, the Record of to-day will show that in the course of a colloquy between the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN] and the illustrious gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY], chairman of the subcommittee that drafted the pending bill, it was stated by the former that Secretary of War Baker was reported to have written a letter in which he alleged that the average cost of maintaining an American soldier in our service in Europe is \$25,000 a year. Of course, the report is not only false but utterly absurd. In order that the statement might not go out to the country unchallenged—and it was not challenged or corrected—I have just called the office of the Secretary, and found the facts in

the case to be as follows: The Secretary wrote a letter to Senator BORAH on January 24, 1921, in which he stated that on September 30, 1920, we had 711 commissioned officers on duty in Europe, and that it was costing the Government, on the average, \$10.76 per day to maintain each of them; and that we had 14,547 enlisted men on duty in Europe, at an average cost of \$3.89 per day for each man.

I make this statement as a matter of simple justice to the head of a great department, that seems, judging from the tone of the debate, without cause to have lost its last friend and for the further purpose of depriving some radical yellow journal of an excuse for printing a preposterous and damaging report as gospel truth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation carried in this pending bill for the purpose of vocational training in the Army of the United States for the next fiscal year has been fixed at \$1,000,000. I want to say that while I have been very much interested in this question of vocational education as a general proposition, I am in no way responsible for the existing law with reference to vocational training in the Army, because it was incorporated first in the national defense act of 1916, before I began my service, and it was carried into the reorganization bill passed at the last session of Congress, against which I voted.

But I simply desire to take a little of the time of the committee this afternoon in calling attention to this proposition. If we are going to attempt to carry out the law of the land as passed by the Congress of the United States providing for a system of vocational training in the Army, it seems to me that it is the duty of Congress to make a sufficient appropriation to carry out that law efficiently, and not restrict it to an appropriation of \$1,000,000, as is provided in this bill.

I say that, gentlemen, largely upon this assumption: Since the creation of this system of vocational education in the Army, the War Department has conducted under authority of law a very elaborate system, seeking the enlistment of the young men of the country in the Army, and in practically every one of the posters with which they have placarded the whole country and the whole countryside it emphasizes the opportunity that young men enlisting in the Army will have of securing vocational training in the arts and professions. "Earn while you learn," for instance. I have a number of such placards here that I obtained this morning by request from the War Department.

You will see that every one of these circulars [exhibiting them] offers inducements to young men—in the Veterinary Corps, for instance, to learn the science of veterinary surgery—vocational training at the service stations; and they have made education, travel, and adventure a feature. You will see in every one of these recruiting placards the statement that this proposition of the advantage that the young men will derive from the educational standpoint by an enlistment in the Army is carried out by the War Department under authority of law. They have made a tremendous appeal to recruits. And I dare say, gentlemen, that on that basis more of the young men of the country—and the average age, I am informed, to-day of the recruits in the Army under the reorganization bill is 19 years—I dare say that a great majority of these young men enlisted not under an implied but a specific promise and pledge of the Government of the United States that during the period of their enlistment they would have the benefits of this vocational training.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will yield for a question.

Mr. CRAMTON. I notice the gentleman's statement that the majority of the young men in the service entered in order to get this training. There are now in the service something like 220,000 men, so that a majority would be well up to 110,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I said of those who enlisted since the enactment of the reorganization bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Has the gentleman any figures on that?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; but I know it from my own personal experience and from the inquiries that I have had from my district with reference to this proposition.

Mr. CRAMTON. The total that are getting this training is less than 50,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Suppose it is less than 50,000. I think the actual figures are 48,000, as given in the hearings, in the testi-

mony of Gen. Haan. I believe the gentleman is a member of the subcommittee that prepared this bill, and he can not justify this appropriation on any testimony that was offered in the hearings. It can only be justified on the arbitrary decision of the members of the subcommittee that \$1,000,000 is sufficient to carry out this entire system of vocational training in the Army, and that arbitrary decision was made in the face of all the testimony offered by the gentlemen who appeared before the committee at the instance of the committee.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will yield further; I do not want to take too much of his time, but in view of the suggestion that the gentleman has made as to the testimony before us, it shows, for instance, without going into other matters, an item of \$3,000,000 for civilian instructors. They want civilian instructors even to teach the boys who want to learn to read and write.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman is talking about estimates, and I am talking about the current appropriation, which provides \$3,500,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. And if you subtract \$3,000,000 even from the estimates, you cut down the estimates close to the million recommended.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman knows that the original estimates of the War Department were for approximately \$11,000,000 on the basis of an Army of 275,000 men. That was later reduced to an estimate of \$5,750,000 plus for the entire work; but I am informed that the testimony of those who were in charge of this work—a work that was placed on them, not by their desire but by the expressed will of Congress a number of years ago when we passed the national defense act—that testimony is that \$3,500,000 is the irreducible minimum with which they can carry on this work decently for the next fiscal year.

Mr. MONDELL rose.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will yield to the gentleman from Wyoming in a moment, if I have the time. I do not know what policy Congress is finally going to decide to follow in reference to this vocational training for the Army. It may be a mistake to have inaugurated it at all. I think it is a mistake to enlist illiterates in the Army of the United States and then assume the burden of educating them after they have been enlisted. I think that is a mistake, and I think the members of the Military Committee ought to bring in legislation here that would absolutely prohibit the enlistment of any illiterate in the Army of the United States, because to-day they have got at least 10,000 men enlisted in the Army who are absolutely illiterate, and I do not think we ought to assume the burden of giving those men a primary education, but I think that burden ought to rest on the local State authorities. But the point I am making, I will say to the gentleman from Wyoming, is that we have entered upon this policy. These young men have been induced to go into the Army on the strength of the assurance that they would be given this character of training, a high standard of vocational training, while they are serving out their enlistment; and it seems to me that the committee have unduly and arbitrarily reduced the amount below what it ought to be to put into effect the real purposes of the existing law on this subject. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am sorry I did not have time to yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. Sisson. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN].

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation of about \$328,000,000 for the Army and about \$6,000,000 for the Military Academy is the most reasonable one we have had in several years. Still this amount is too high.

An Army cut to 150,000 men is certainly, in my judgment, a necessity of the times. The resolution that the House and Senate passed making it 175,000 men might have been put through for reasons best known to the steering committee and to the War Department, but this House is coming up now with an appropriation for an Army of only 150,000 men, and that is a little paradoxical.

If the gentleman from Kansas can carry out his guaranty that after the 4th of March the Army will be reduced and by July it will be 175,000 and by next January it will be 150,000, we still will be bound to come forward at some later period with a deficiency appropriation. All this camouflage about what we are saving when it is manifest deficiency bills must be passed at the next Congress can not deceive the public pocketbook. The people of the United States call upon every public servant they have for economy in government. No longer than this morning, with already \$47,000,000 available, there was a motion made to recommit the river and harbor bill and add to the \$15,000,000

which it carried \$13,000,000 more. Some pork-barrel statesmen said, "Let us vote for it." I believe, gentlemen, when we talk here for economy we ought to vote economy, and I am one Democrat who is going to join with you Republicans if you will stand for economy so soon as President Harding comes into the White House. [Applause.]

Already the people of the United States are groaning under heavy taxation. With the State and county assessments, the city government added to it, it makes the local taxation nearly one-sixteenth of the real value of the property. Six or six and a half per cent every year is not uncommon in this country for taxation. You add on to that the high expense of the Federal Government, reaching out with all its activities and additional calls upon Congress to put some new grabbing scheme on the statute books. What can the people of the country expect? It is time for the American Congress to measure up to the standard and call a halt, and say we will make the tax legislation of this country commensurate with the public ability to pay.

Who believes that the United States is in danger and is in need of a great standing Army now? Local papers in every county in the United States contain the statement that boys are still being enlisted in the Army of the United States when Congress, by positive resolution, has called attention of the department to the fact that 175,000 is all that the Government will stand for. Yet they are going into the Army, and the bills must be paid. I do not know if the Secretary of War has official knowledge of what this Congress intends to do. We say we will have 150,000 soldiers and a resolution stated that it should be 175,000. What will the new Secretary of War understand by it? Will the gentleman from Kansas be able to carry out the guaranty that 150,000 will be the maximum? Is he in a position to say what the new Secretary of War will stand for? Congress must decide on what this shall be. Reaching out with all this vocational education endeavoring to make a primary school out of the Army is a very costly attraction to the youth of the country.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does the gentleman want the House to understand that he thinks the bill does not carry sufficient appropriation?

Mr. QUIN. I know that Congress will be called on at the next session to bring forth a deficiency for the Army. [Applause.] And the gentleman standing there knows it just as well as he knows that the stars are fixed in the heavens. We know that it is impossible for an army of 232,000 men to be reduced by the 1st of July, 1921, to 150,000 men. With all this great crowd of officers, with this expensive grabhook reaching out, with this very bill carrying these activities, with a large number of civilian employees to carry on certain work that the soldiers ought to do in the cantonments or camps all over the United States, how do you expect to get along on \$328,000,000? So far as I am concerned, I am going to tell gentlemen the truth. I know that \$328,000,000 is not going to be sufficient when you have on the books a resolution for 175,000 men.

Mr. KNUTSON. Who employs these civilian employees that the gentleman complains of?

Mr. QUIN. The General Staff directs the policy. You have not cut them out; you can not cut them out right away. They are laborers, professors, and such like; they are going to stay, and as one gentleman said he was afraid that we were going to have too much of a skeleton army. He was afraid that we would not have a great organization, he was afraid that we were not going to have enough Infantry to go out and kill people. That is what he is scared of. The skeleton army seems to be the want of the General Staff; they want a chemical division; they want a division for everything, even the supervision of all the little vocational gardens in the country. We have reached out, we have got out of the general purpose of the Army of the United States when established to create different potentialities that were never contemplated and that are costing the taxpayers of this Government huge sums of money.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. I can not yield further. The trouble is that every department of the Government is costing in the same relative proportion, and as my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] stated on this floor, the people are bearing the burden. The cost of Government expenses and all the corollaries equals the net earnings of all the people of the United States, according to the best estimates we can make. Where are we going to end? Some folks say that we are going to take off taxes. Who believes that you will ever be able to take off taxes with the present high cost of Government and with all of these bonds that we have issued requiring a sinking fund to be laid aside, and the interest to be paid upon them? Who believes, with your



maternity bill and the Smith-Towner and every other bill that is going to cost millions of dollars, that you are going to reduce taxes? Who believes that you can reduce the taxation when you keep adding on activities which will be bound to reach up into the billions of dollars? [Applause.]

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Blanton].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] would have the country believe that the great Military Affairs Committee, notwithstanding the fact that its appropriating power has been lodged in some other committee, is impotent; that it does not know how to draw matters of legislation of the simplest kind. He admits that the War Department is constantly using the funds appropriated for one purpose by Congress for other purposes and that it continues to transfer those funds at will and against the wish of Congress and against the will of the Military Affairs Committee. I do not agree with him in his insinuation that the Military Affairs Committee can not stop it. I know, and he knows, that if the Committee on Military Affairs wants to stop that it has the power of legislation now to bring in a measure to-morrow and to get a rule from the Committee on Rules—

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Right there I want to say—

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, let me first finish my sentence. I do not want the gentleman to stop me in the middle of a sentence—the Military Affairs Committee could bring in a measure to-morrow if it wanted to, and if it had enough influence with the steering committee it could get a rule from the Committee on Rules making it in order and could pass it here in 30 minutes stopping the War Department from doing these very things that the gentleman from Mississippi says it does; but the committee does not want to do that. I yield.

Mr. ANTHONY. The evil that the gentleman speaks of came from the practice of Congress permitting in the old appropriation bills what are called lump-sum clauses, where three or four different items are combined into one sum for the purpose of accounting. If he will read over the bill—

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the gentleman has had an hour and I have just five minutes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman let me finish?

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry, but I can not afford to give my little five minutes up to a gentleman who has spoken for an hour. I am not talking about what has been in the past, but I am talking about what is in front of us now. If this committee wants to stop this practice, why does it not do it?

Mr. ANTHONY. It has done it.

Mr. BLANTON. I can draw a provision in 15 minutes, if they will bring it in and get a rule and make it a law, that will stop the War Department and the Chief of Staff from transferring these funds at will, stop them from spending money for purposes Congress does not design. It is all with Congress. The trouble is with Congress and this great Military Affairs Committee. The members in authority have too many pets among the high Army officers. The Chief of "Staff" and his various lieutenants can come in here before the prominent members of the Military Affairs, Appropriation, and steering committees and get what they want, usually. They can bring influence to bear upon each one of them and make them do something they do not want to do. If that is not the case, why do they not stop it? The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. Mondell] knows how to stop it if he wants to, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Madden] knows how to stop it, if he wants to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. Mondell].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the War Department has charge of a service of public defense. Upon the War Department rests the duty of guarding and protecting the Republic, and a department charged with obligations, duties, and responsibilities of that kind can not be absolutely circumscribed and held to close and definite bounds in its expenditures. There is no one here, not even the gentleman from Texas who has just taken his seat, who would vote for a provision of law under which just so much and no more could be expended for the pay of the Army, no matter what happened.

Mr. BLANTON. I would, and stop there.

Mr. MONDELL. Of course, the gentleman from Texas is not utterly regardless of the welfare of the Nation, and in case of invasion, in case of an emergency which required the enlistment of an additional number of men, he would not be willing to take a chance. I am certain he is not unmindful of the public welfare.

Mr. BLANTON. No; I am not.

Mr. MONDELL. Then the gentleman would not vote for that kind of a provision, in my opinion; he would not vote for a provision which allocated every item of expenditure for any department of national defense and left it absolutely without any option or opportunity to use a certain portion of funds other than those appropriated for a definite purpose for that purpose if the emergency required it. We can not bind these services down as we do a civil service to the expenditure of just so many dollars and no more. The nature of the service is such that Congress can not take the responsibility of saying to a dollar what the War Department shall have for Army pay, what it shall use for transportation, what shall be the outlay for food. There must be some leeway and discretion. [Applause.] There must be opportunity for expansion in case of emergency, and because that is so, because the Congress can not and should not too closely bind and circumscribe and limit the expenditures of such a department, the responsibility resting upon those at the head of those departments is all the greater not to expend beyond the amount allotted and provided by the Congress for any particular purpose unless there is a national emergency demanding it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. May I have five additional minutes?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. And that, Mr. Chairman, is what makes the action of the Secretary of War in enlisting at great cost many thousands of men far beyond the number contemplated by Congress when it passed the appropriation bill so reprehensible. We can not put the Secretary of War in jail for having done that, because we can not, in view of a possible emergency, bind him absolutely as to his expenditures, but, knowing what the Congress contemplated, knowing as he did know just how many men the appropriations he had would pay, knowing, as he himself stated, that there was nothing in the way of an emergency either at home or abroad compelling or suggesting an increase above the number of men which Congress appropriated for, the Secretary is subject to the severest condemnation for having pursued the course he did. Now, in this bill the committee has gone further than committees have gone in the recent past in attempting to segregate items and in attempting to allot and allocate them so as to avoid the temptation to using them for purposes other than those contemplated by the Congress. It has made a distinct advance in that regard; some may think that the committee is subject to some slight criticism for having gone further in that regard than we have in the past, and possibly so far as to involve the danger of hampering the department in case of emergency. I do not think they have, but, as far as the committee has gone, there are still opportunities under an appropriation for the Army for abuse. But, great heavens, have we reached that point in the affairs of the Republic that we can not trust an executive officer in the slightest degree?

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman just reached that point a few moments ago in his statement that he could not trust the Secretary of War.

Mr. MONDELL. Could not what? My query is, Have we reached the point where we can not trust an executive officer to exercise a discretion that is essential for the welfare and safety of the Republic?

Have we reached the point where we must so bind down the Secretaries of War and Navy that in case of emergency the welfare and safety of the Republic might be threatened? I deny that we have reached that condition. Unfortunately we have had woeful abuse of executive discretion under this administration, but I decline to charge it to the Democrats of the country, because I do not believe they approve it, and I do hope that under a new administration we will have men in charge of these affairs that will realize their responsibility to the people of the Republic. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Volk].

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirteen gentlemen are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. Volk] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. VOLK. Mr. Chairman, in fact the whole program seemed to be one of suppression and oppression, to silence the wrath

and indignation of every branch of the community. Newspapers were even warned that their utterances might produce dire results, all for the purpose of preventing just and proper criticism of the extraordinary action of the court and the receiver in the litigation.

Two years have elapsed and not a thing, save what will be hereinafter referred to, has been accomplished through this receivership. To-day the matter is practically where it was two years ago. In the meantime the disintegration of this system was begun—transfers have been abolished, cars have been withdrawn, lines have been discontinued, to the end that by suspension of branches of the service an extra fare is being charged for transit through this borough. The city of New York, in desperation of the breakdown of the transportation system, introduced the operation of busses. These busses gave extraordinary service and were a source of great satisfaction to the people. The receiver made application for and obtained an injunction stopping the operation of busses, and the people of Brooklyn must be satisfied with only such services as the receiver of the Brooklyn Rapid Transit system is willing to accord them.

There should be no misunderstanding of the transit situation in the city of New York. This company, with others, is under a contract obligation with the city to transport passengers within the city for a 5-cent fare. This contract and its validity have been established by the courts. To circumvent this contract and deviate from its plain terms and provisions has been the work of this receivership, and it is not transcending a truthful statement of the situation to say that that was in the minds of the actors when the litigation was begun.

Branches of this system, which have been in existence for years, and which have been and now are indispensable to the welfare of citizens of this center of population, are being suspended upon the pretext that they do not pay and must be discontinued because the operation of them represents a losing venture. This can not be true. For years the lines which have been suspended have been actively and intensively used by the people. They traverse the most populous part of the borough. Their suspension is a mere club designed to aid in the propaganda now being conducted for a higher rate of fare in the city. No one can gainsay the claim advanced by the receiver that these roads do not pay, since no one would have the courage to demand the truth in the matter, in view of the previous attitude of the United States court in its treatment of those who questioned its action.

The result is that to-day numerous branches of the system have been suspended and the threat is now made that a large number of other branches will be suspended from operation in the very near future. All this is done under the guise and pretense of economy, the claim being made that the branches do not pay and that a discontinuance is made necessary by reason of the loss incurred in operation. Upon that point permit me to direct attention to something that has just come to the notice of the public in connection with the administration of the system.

The receiver of the corporation, Lindley M. Garrison, is shown to have had paid to him and his assistant \$125,000 as partial payment for his services for one year. In addition, and in order further to bolster up this claim that the transportation system represents a losing venture, it paid \$133,000 to so-called experts for a valuation of the system. In other words, so far as the public have been able to get at the records of this receivership for one year, it has shown that \$258,000 or more had been expended for a purely nominal service of a receiver. Think of it, \$125,000 as partial payment for one year's services of a receiver who is a resident of another State, who possibly seldom, if ever, visited Brooklyn before his appointment, who is not a traction man, and who is not familiar with traction matters, particularly those of the Borough of Brooklyn. In addition, a payment of \$133,000 for an appraisal that never was needed and should never have been undertaken as an incident to the receivership. In fact, these items are clearly illegal and without sanction or authority in law, yet both items were sanctioned by direct orders of the court under circumstances that certainly ought to be questioned by anyone interested in an economical administration of the affairs of this company, which is filling the air with cries and lamentations that it is not making money.

It must be borne in mind that the receiver, Mr. Garrison, is in no sense devoting his time and attention exclusively to the work of the receivership. If reports are to be credited, he is conducting his law business in the usual manner, and the management and administration of the transportation system is in the hands of precisely the same force, including its president, as

has administered it for years past. There is no change in the personnel of the real managing and administering force of the company. From this it will be perceived that the receivership is a mere nominal one. The payment of \$125,000 to him and to his assistant must shock anyone who understands the situation in connection with this company. With the aid of the court, on one hand it holds in check the people who have had disaster brought to their fireside by its negligence, while with the other hand it bestows largess and bounty upon those who have done nothing and have added positively nothing of value to it. And in this, the aid and agency is the district court of the United States, which under the mantle of equity, the maxim of which is "conscience, good faith, and reasonable diligence," has sanctioned this practical looting of the treasury of this company, and yet this may be only a detail of what has been disposed of through this equitable receivership, so called. The real amount which has been abstracted from this company under the forms of law and the orders of the court can not be learned until some agency of investigation undertakes the work of ascertaining it. The attitude of the public of the city of New York can not be misunderstood. In the city of New York, certainly in the Borough of Brooklyn, with its 2,000,000 of people, since the day war was declared, nothing has aroused the public so much as this shocking state of affairs and the maladministration which it indicates. There is no division of sentiment in regard to what should be done. Everything connected with the inception and progress of this litigation has branded it as opposed to public interest and a scheme to throw a mantle of legal protection around the conduct of the affairs of the company, and thus the acts of the receiver are kept screened from public scrutiny. The public demand that it should be exposed. Recently the Brooklyn Rapid Transit system, in unison with other transportation lines in the city, made application to the Board of Estimate and Apportionment for an increased fare.

The board began public hearings to determine the justice of the company's demand. These public hearings resolved themselves into an investigation which proceeded only far enough to show the demoralization of the company due to the receivership when the application was suddenly withdrawn and forced a discontinuance of the investigation. The experience of the comptroller of the city of New York shows that exposure can not come through any agency except the Congress of the United States. A committee of the New York State Legislature, composed of senators and assemblymen of the affected borough, made a formal and written application for an appointment with the court for a conference on the question of the termination of the receivership, which was diplomatically declined on the ground that the occasion did not warrant it.

No legislative—State or municipal—agency can undertake this inquiry and investigation, in view of what has transpired and in view of the attitude of the United States court. The sole means by which the public can be enlightened upon this all-important matter is the privileged investigation which a committee of Congress alone can conduct. The honor of the courts of the United States appears to be involved in this matter.

The litigation, collusive in its inception, has been imposed upon the courts of the United States. It has been termed by the parties themselves "a friendly receivership." It has been prolonged for two years, to the end that this receivership might continue and the people of the Borough of Brooklyn harassed and oppressed thereby. If the courts of the United States are not to be a hissing and a byword, this species of maladministration must be exposed and summarily dealt with. The means at hand should be availed of at once if the honor and dignity of our courts are to be upheld and the respect to which they are entitled perpetuated in the minds of the people. [Applause.]

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LEHLBACH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 15943, the Army appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### FIRST STATE BANK OF KERRVILLE, TEX.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Speaker, I call from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 7050, and I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title. The Clerk read as follows:

An act (H. R. 7050) for the relief of the First State Bank of Kerrville, Kerr County, State of Texas.



The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

The question being on concurring in the Senate amendment, the amendment was agreed to.

#### CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House dispense with Calendar Wednesday business tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the majority leader give us some idea of when we may reach private bills and other bills on the Private Calendar?

Mr. MONDELL. I hope very soon after we dispose of the appropriation bills. There are only two more.

Mr. SEARS. Then you think we will have some chance to reach those bills?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. FRENCH, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of John W. Reddington (H. R. 8332), first session, Sixty-sixth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Messrs. GOODALL, WHITE of Maine, PETERS, and HERSEY, for three days, for the purpose of attending the funeral of the governor of Maine.

To Mr. CANDLER, for last Saturday and this week, on account of serious illness in his family.

To Mr. FOCHT, indefinitely, on account of death in family.

To Mr. ASHBROOK, for two weeks, on account of important business.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 2, 1921, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

385. A letter from the president of the Georgetown Gas Light Co., transmitting annual report of that corporation for the year ending December 31, 1920; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

386. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of information in response to House resolution 648 in connection with the purchase of German airplanes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

387. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Plymouth Harbor, Mass. (H. Doc. No. 996); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with map.

388. A letter from the president of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting annual reports for the year ending December 31, 1920, for that corporation and the Washington Interurban Railway Co., the City & Suburban Railway Co., the Georgetown & Tennytown Railway Co., and the Potomac Electric Power Co.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

389. A letter from the president of the Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting annual report of the corporation for the year ending December 31, 1920; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

390. A letter from the chief clerk of the Patent Office, transmitting annual report of the Commissioner of Patents for the year ending December 31, 1920; to the Committee on Patents.

391. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting requested item for consideration in the deficiency appropriation bill, in connection with the case of Kristina Furrack; to the Committee on Claims.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. GOOD, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15962) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1274); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PARKER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 161) to exempt the New York State Barge Canal from the provisions of section 201 of House bill 10453, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1275), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WARD, from the Committee on Agriculture, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 444), authorizing the President to require the United States Sugar Equalization Board to take over and dispose of 13,902 tons of sugar imported from the Argentine Republic, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1276), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. IGOE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15916) to amend section 101 of the Judicial Code, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1277), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SNYDER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4039) to amend section 3 of the act of Congress of June 28, 1906, entitled "An act for the division of the lands and funds of the Osage Indians in Oklahoma, and for other purposes," reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1278), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15953) further regulating the granting of visés by diplomatic and consular officers of the United States, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1280), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. KEARNS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13756) for the relief of William Thomas Matingley, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1279), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 15962) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. COADY: A bill (H. R. 15963) to amend and reenact the first paragraph of subdivision (a) of section 200 of the transportation act, 1920; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 15964) to authorize deduction of war-risk insurance premiums from the war-service bonus payable under the act approved February 24, 1919, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 15965) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across Pearl River, between Pearl River County, Miss., and Washington Parish, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 15966) authorizing an appropriation for continuing irrigation and drainage on the Yakima Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PARK: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 464) providing for the monetization of the bonds issued by the United States of America during the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 465) for the appointment of one member of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, urging naval defense for the Puget Sound country; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, favoring a tariff on all flower, vegetable, and other agricultural seeds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, favoring a bill for the promotion of Gen. Crowder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, urging the passage of House bill 15372, regarding the leasing of certain oil lands in Washington; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, favoring the passage of a bill authorizing the Secretary of War to turn over to the Secretary of the Treasury for the use of the Public Health Service the military reservation at Fort Logan H. Roots, Ark.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, requesting an appropriation to provide for the prompt and complete construction of locks and dams in the Ouachita River, according to the War Department plans, to insure permanent navigation from Camden, Ark., and New Orleans to the Gulf; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging adoption of the Wadsworth resolution to discontinue Federal operations on the canal system of that State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCARTHUR: Memorial of the Oregon State Legislature relative to the hospitalization and retraining of disabled ex-service men; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DOMINICK: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, urging Federal aid for post roads in South Carolina; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, favoring legislation for ex-soldiers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DUNBAR: A bill (H. R. 15967) granting an increase of pension to Loudica Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15968) granting a pension to William H. Grimes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15969) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Lofton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15970) granting an increase of pension to Angie E. Leslie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: A bill (H. R. 15971) for the relief of Joseph A. Willens; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 15972) granting a pension to Mattie J. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5389. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of Bakersfield (Calif.) Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, relating to the Curtis-Dyer antilynching bill, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5390. By Mr. BURROUGHS: Petition of Miss E. M. Newell, corresponding secretary of Woman's Club of Hanover, N. H., indorsing the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5391. Also, petition of B. M. Stovall, secretary Midcity Citizens' Association, indorsing House joint resolution 11; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5392. By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of St. James Parish, Cleveland, Ohio, favoring recognition of the Irish republic by our Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5393. By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Rotary Club of Key West, Fla., favoring the enactment of House bill 14899; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5394. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Illinois Manufacturers' Association, opposing blanket appropriations for rivers and harbors; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

5395. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Resolutions of American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, of Massachusetts, John F. Harrigan, president, protesting against deportation of Lord Mayor Donal O'Callaghan, of Cork, Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5396. Also, resolutions of Roger Casement Council, American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, Jeremiah Carroll, chairman, appealing to Congress to demand payment of loan to England; also send home the British ambassador, Sir Eric Geddes, as a protest against the crimes of the British Government in Ireland; also to recognize the republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5397. Also, resolutions of Roger Casement Council, American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, Jeremiah Carroll, chairman, protesting against deportation of Lord Mayor Donal O'Callaghan, of Cork, Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5398. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of Export and Import Board of Trade, Baltimore, Md., opposing Senate bill 4542; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

5399. Also, petition of the National City Bank of Baltimore and the Jacob C. Shafer Co., both of Baltimore, Md., opposing the Gronna bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5400. Also, petition of the Canton Lumber Co., Baltimore, Md., relating to appropriation for rivers and harbors; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5401. Also, petition of Robert S. Hart, Baltimore, Md., favoring turnover tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5402. By Mr. MCARTHUR: Petition of the University of Oregon, School of Journalism, asking a Federal investigation of the paper industry of Oregon; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5403. By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of Local No. 390, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, of New York, protesting against the order which abolished special clerks in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

5404. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: Petition of residents of Suttons Bay, Mich., protesting against the occupation of Germany by French Negro troops; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5405. By Mr. MOONEY: Petition of the United Commercial Travelers of America, Euclid Council, No. 421, Cleveland, Ohio, favoring 1-cent letter drop postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

5406. By Mr. MORIN: Petition of prominent citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against bill which provides for severe restrictions regarding work and enjoyment of innocent pastimes on Sunday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5407. By Mr. REBER: Petition of the Pennsylvania Branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, favoring a reduction of the Navy building program; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

5408. Also, petition of the Pennsylvania branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, relating to military expenses; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5409. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of about 150 farmers in western North Dakota, favoring the immediate passage of House bill 15453, guaranteeing a price of \$2.26 per bushel for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5410. By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation, opposing any tariff on lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5411. By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Queen's Daughters, of Providence, R. I., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5412. By Mr. YATES: Petition of parent-teachers' associations of Decatur, Ill., urging an appropriation for the continuation of work against venereal diseases, by Mrs. Mary T. Starr; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5413. Also, petition of the National Board of Marine Underwriters, New York City, urging the passage of House bill 13591; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

5414. Also, petition of W. S. McKee, president American Manganese Steel Co., Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of the McFadden bill (H. R. 13201); to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

5415. Also, petition of Tanners' Products Co., Chicago, Ill., strongly in favor of an appropriation by the Government to help



defray the cost of transporting food to be sent to the starving people of Europe; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5416. Also, petition of W. B. Taylor, Chicago, Ill., urging legislation protecting the lemon and citrus growers of this country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5417. Also, petition of Bay & River Boat Owners' Association, San Francisco, Calif., urging the passage of House bill 13591; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

5418. Also, petition of A. F. Wine, of the American Cooperative Publishing Co., Chicago, Ill., urging the passage of the Fess-Capper bill (H. R. 12652); to the Committee on Education.

5419. Also, petition of the Chicago Clearing House, by Mr. Thomas C. Stibbs, favoring Senate bill 3374, relative to a 2-cent piece; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

5420. Also, petition of Kendall County Farm Bureau, Yorkville, Ill., favoring the French-Capper truth-in-fabric bill (H. R. 11641); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5421. Also, petition of F. R. Warner, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., urging the passage of House bill 13591; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

5422. Also, petition of the Licensed Tugmen's Protective Association of America, Chicago, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 15746; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

5423. Also, petition of Elgin Church of the Brethren, Elgin, Ill., urging the passage of the Jones-Randall bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5424. Also, petition of Will County Women's Christian Temperance Union, Joliet, Ill., urging the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5425. Also, petition of C. H. Perkins, Decatur, Ill., favoring the passage of the Elkins bill (S. 4596); to the Committee on Pensions.

5426. Also, petition of Ottawa (Ill.) Rotary Club, urging speedy justice to disabled soldiers now subject to delay; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5427. By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of James A. Kelland Post, No. 111, of Blinford, and William Whalen Post, No. 101, of Leeds, both in the State of North Dakota, of the American Legion, regarding legislation for disabled soldiers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5428. By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Petition of the Wednesday Club, Sandy Spring, Md., and the A. Y. L. I. Club, Germantown, Md., favoring the Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5429. Also, petition of Current Comment Club, Forest Glen, Md., favoring the Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5430. Also, petition of Golden Rule Council, No. 6, Junior Order United American Mechanics, relating to the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, February 2, 1921.

Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., the Chaplain, offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee that our times are in Thy hands; and with such custodianship and direction we would ask Thee to help us to conform our lives to Thy good pleasure. As we live and labor may we honor Thee, seek the best interests of our beloved land, and the furtherance of Thy kingdom through the earth. For Jesus' sake. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Monday, January 31, 1921, when, on request of Mr. McCUMBER and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

LINCOLN MEMORIAL (S. DOC. NO. 372).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the chairman of the Lincoln Memorial Commission, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$363,000, required for the completion of the Lincoln Memorial in West Potomac Park, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

INLAND TRANSPORTATION BY STAR ROUTES (S. DOC. NO. 371).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Postmaster General, submitting a supple-

mental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$1,363,000, required by the Post Office Department for inland transportation by star routes, payable from postal revenues, for the fiscal year 1921, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

TRANSPORTATION OF MAILS (S. DOC. NO. 373).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Postmaster General, submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$65,575,832.03, required by the Post Office Department for transportation of the mails by the United States Railroad Administration during the 26 months of Federal control of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Commissioner of Patents, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the commissioner for the year ended December 31, 1920, which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

CAPITAL TRACTION CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Capital Traction Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that company for the year 1920, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON RAILWAY & ELECTRIC CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that company for the year ended December 31, 1920, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that company for the year ended December 31, 1920, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

CITY & SUBURBAN RAILWAY OF WASHINGTON.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the City & Suburban Railway of Washington for the year ended December 31, 1920, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

GEORGETOWN & TENNALLYTOWN RAILWAY CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Georgetown & Tennallytown Railway Co. for the year ended December 31, 1920, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

WASHINGTON INTERURBAN RAILROAD CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Washington Interurban Railroad Co. for the year ended December 31, 1920, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that company for the year ended December 31, 1920, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

GEORGETOWN GAS LIGHT CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Georgetown Gas Light Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that company for the year ended December 31, 1920, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7050) for the relief of the First State Bank of Kerrville, Kerr County, State of Texas.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 15935) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.